



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्रधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. १३]
No. १३]

नई विल्ली, रामगढ़, मार्च २७, १९८२/चैत्र ६, १९०४
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1982/CHAITRA 6, 1904

इस भाग में चिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह ग्रन्थ संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation.

भाग II—खण्ड ३—उप-खण्ड (II)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (II)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

विधि, न्याय और कानूनी कार्य मंत्रालय
(विधि कार्य विभाग)

सूचनाएं

नई विल्ली, ११ मार्च, १९८२

सं. आ० १२४६.—नोटरीज नियम, १९५६ के नियम ६ के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री रामबाबू श्रीवास्तव, अधिवक्ता, जेलरोड, सीतापुर उ० प्र० ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम ४ के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे सीतापुर जिले में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

२. उक्त अविक्त की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के बीच दिन के लिए लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. ५ (६२)/८१-न्या०]

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS
(Department of Legal Affairs)

NOTICES

New Delhi, the 11th March, 1982

S.O. 1246.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Ram Babu Srivastava, Advocate, Jail Road, U.P. for appointment as a Notary to practise in Sitapur District of UP.

1436 GI/81—1

(1409)

२. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

(No. F. 5(62)/81-Judl.)

नई विल्ली, १२ मार्च, १९८२

सं. आ० १२४७.—नोटरीज नियम, १९५६ के नियम ६ के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री दिलोक चंद्र सिंहल, अधिवक्ता दौलतपांज, ग्वालियर ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम ४ के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे ग्वालियर, म० प्र० में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

२. उक्त अविक्त की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के बीच हूँ दिन के लिए लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं. ५ (७६)/८१-न्या०]

के० सौ० डौ० गंगवानी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1982

S.O. 1247.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Trilok Chand Singh, Advocate Daulat Ganj, Gwalior for appointment as a Notary to practise in Gwalior, M.P.

२. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

(No. F. 5(76)/81-Judl.)
K. C. D. GANGWANI, Competent Authority

(कंपनी कार्य विभाग)

नई विल्सी, 18 मार्च, 1982

का० आ० 1248—एकाधिकार तथा अवरोधक व्यापारिक व्यवहार अधिनियम, 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 26 की उप-धारा (3) के प्रत्युत्तरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा मैसर्स बैड एंड कंपनी लिमिटेड, के कथित अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण (पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 509/70) के निरस्तीकरण को प्रभिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 16/6/81-एम०-3]

(Department of Company Affairs)

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1982

S.O. 1248.—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of the registration of M/s. Bld & Company Limited under the said Act (Certificate of Registration No. 509/70).

[No. 16/6/81-M.III]

का० आ० 1249—एकाधिकार तथा अवरोधक व्यापारिक व्यवहार अधिनियम, 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 26 की उप-धारा (3) के प्रत्युत्तरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा मैसर्स बैड (इंडिया) लिमिटेड (पहले की जारी सैल्टर लिं.) के कथित अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण (पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 581/71) के निरस्तीकरण को प्रभिसूचित करती है।

[संख्या 16/10/81-एम०-3]

S.O. 1249.—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of the registration of M/s. Weighbird (India) Limited (Formerly George Salter India Limited) under the said Act (Certificate of Registration No. 581/71).

[No. 16/10/81-M. III]

का० आ० 1250—एकाधिकार तथा अवरोधक व्यापारिक व्यवहार अधिनियम, 1969 (1969 का 54) की धारा 26 की उप-धारा (3) के प्रत्युत्तरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा मैसर्स बैड एंड एस्पोर्ट्स लिमिटेड के कथित अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण (पंजीकरण प्रमाण-पत्र संख्या 504/70) के निरस्तीकरण को प्रभिसूचित करती है।

[संख्या 16/11/81-एम०-3]

बंद्रकात खुशालदाम, निदेशक

S.O. 1250.—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of Section 26 of the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969 (54 of 1969), the Central Government hereby notifies the cancellation of the registration of M/s. Birds Jute & Exports Limited under the said Act (Certificate of Registration No. 504/70).

[No. 16/10/81-M. III]
C. KHUSHALDAS, Director

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 16th March, 1982

S.O. 1251.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. S.O. 776(E), dated the 26th October, 1981 as published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II Section 3-Sub-section (ii), dated the 26th October, 1981, at page 1356.

In the said notification—in line 12, for “session”, read “secession”.

[F. No. 11/12/81-NE.I]
I. P. GUPTA, Jr. Secy.

पूर्ण मंत्रालय

(कार्यालय और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

अवैदेश

नई विल्सी, 11 मार्च, 1982

का० आ० 1252—दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रवत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य सरकार की सहमति से, एतद्वारा भागरे का बाड़ा, घालियर के निवासी श्री भारतनंद सिंह का राय बरेली से पहली जनवरी, 1980 को व्यवहारण किए जाने के आरोपों के संबंध में भारतीय वर्ष संहिता, 1860 (1860 का 45) की धारा 364 तथा 365 के अधीन दण्डनीय अपराधों तथा अक्त अपराधों के सम्बन्ध में अथवा उनसे सम्बन्धित प्रयत्नों, बुल्ड्रेण्डों और बड्डेण्डों तथा उसी संबंधवार के दौरान किए गए किन्हीं अन्य अपराधों का घान्वेषण करने के लिए विल्सी विशेष पुलिस स्थापना के सदस्यों की शक्तियों पर्व अधिकारिता का समस्त उत्तर प्रवेश राज्य में विस्तार करती है।

[संख्या 228/5/81 ए० श० श०-II]

ए० क० बर्मा, प्रबल सचिव

(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th March, 1982

S.O. 1252.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), the Central Government, with the consent of the Government of the State of Uttar Pradesh, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Uttar Pradesh for the investigation of offences punishable under sections 364 and 365 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (45 of 1860) and attempts, abettments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences and any other offences committed in the course of the same transaction, in regard to the allegations of abduction of Shri Bhartendra Singh, a resident of Angre Ka Bara, Gwalior, from Rae Bareilly on 1st January, 1980.

[No. 228/5/81-AVD-II]

H. K. VERMA, Under Secy.

विशेष मंत्रालय

(अध्य विभाग)

महासेवा नियंत्रक, नई विल्सी

नई विल्सी, 16 मार्च, 1982

का० आ० 1253—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 239 के अंडे (1) के प्रत्युत्तरण में यह निर्देश देते हैं कि 1 अग्रील, 1982 से अस्त्रावल प्रवेश, गोवा, दमत और शीर्ष, मिहीराम और पाठ्वारी संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के प्रशासक, उनके नियंत्रक के अधीन रहते हुए, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 150 के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार के उन वृत्तों का भी, जहाँ तक उनका संबंध उनके अपने-अपने संघ राज्य के क्षेत्रों के विभिन्न सुध्य और लघु शीर्षों के अधीन उप-शीर्ष और अधीरेकार, लेखा-पीर्फ खोलने से संबंधित है, निम्नलिखित शर्तों के प्रवीन रहते हुए, निर्वहन करेंगे, प्रथम् :—

(क) इन्होंने आ उक्त निर्वहन अनुच्छेद 150 के प्रधीन राष्ट्रपति द्वारा विहित प्रक्रियों के प्रधीन रहते हुए किया जाएगा; और

(प) केन्द्रीय सरकार संबंधित संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों को, उक्त क्षुप्तों के निझेहन के संबंध में संघ राज्य क्षेत्र द्वारा उपगत किसी प्रतिरिक्ष प्रशासन संग्रह से संबंधित किसी राशि का संदाय नहीं करेगी।

[संख्या एस० 11036/1/78/टी० ए०/भाग 1/668]
तारा बाई एस० कुट्टी, संयुक्त महालेला नियमांक

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Expenditure)
(Controller General of Accounts)

New Delhi, the 16th March, 1982

S.O. 1253.—In pursuance of clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution, the President hereby directs that with effect from the 1st April, 1982, the Administrators of the Union Territories of Arunachal Pradesh, Goa, Daman and Diu, Mizoram and Pondicherry shall, subject to this control, also discharge the functions of the Central Government under article 150 of the Constitution in so far as such functions relate to the opening of sub-heads and detailed heads of account under the various Major and Minor heads of account within their respective territories, subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (a) that the said discharge of functions shall be subject to the forms prescribed by the President under article 150; and
- (b) that no sums shall be paid by the Central Government to the Union Territory concerned in respect of any extra cost of administration incurred in connection with the said discharge of functions.

[No. S. 11036/1/78/TA]Pt. I/662]

TARA BAI. S. KUTTY, Lt. Controller
General of Accounts

(आधिक कार्य विभाग)

(वैराग्य प्रबोधन)

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1982

का० आ० 1254 :—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबन्ध और प्रक्रीण उपबन्ध) योजना, 1980 के खण्ड 3 उपबन्ध (क) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श के पश्चात् श्री राजेन्द्र प्रताप सिंह, 4 चंदपुर हाउस, रायबेरेली (उत्तर प्रदेश) को, एतद्वारा 8 मार्च, 1982 से भारतीय होकर 7 मार्च, 1985 को समाप्त होने वाली तीन वर्ष की प्रबंधि के लिए क्षुप्तों के हितों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के बास्ते, पंजाब एवं सिवाय बैंक के एक वरिष्ठ नियोगीक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एफ० 9/40/81-भी० घो०-I]

नई दिल्ली, मार्च 17, 1982

New Delhi, the March, 17th 1982/

का० आ० 1257.—25 दिसंबर, 1981 की भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की भौतिक विभाग कार्यकालाव का विवरण

S.O. 1257.—STATEMENT OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE RESERVE BANK OF INDIA BANKING DEPARTMENT
as on the 25th December, 1981

देयताएँ LIABILITIES	चाप्ते Rs.	प्राप्तियाँ ASSETS	उपर्युक्त Rs.
1	2	3	4
कृता पूँजी Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	नोट Notes	64,02,59,000
प्रारंभित निधि Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का Rupee Coin	3,82,000

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1982

S.O. 1254.—In pursuance of sub-clause (e) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Bank (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1980, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri Rajendra Pratap Singh, 4, Chandapur House, Rae Bareli (Uttar Pradesh) as a Director of the Punjab and Sind Bank for a period of three years commencing on the 8th day of March, 1982 and ending with the 7th day of March, 1985 to represent the interests of farmers.

[No. F. 9/40/81-BO.I]

का० आ० 1255 :—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबन्ध तथा प्रक्रीण उपबन्ध) स्कीम, 1980 के खण्ड 3 के उपबन्ध (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करके, एतद्वारा श्री जीधरी नसीम प्रह्लाद स्टेशन रोड, रायबेरेली (उत्तर प्रदेश) को किसानों के हितों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने के लिए मार्च, 1982 के 8वें दिन से प्रारम्भ होकर, मार्च, 1985 के 7वें दिन को समाप्त होने वाली 3 वर्ष की प्रबंधि के लिए न्यू बैंक प्राफ इम्प्रिया के एक नियोगीक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एफ० 9/41/81-भी० घो०-1]

S.O. 1255.—In pursuance of sub-clause (e) of clause 3 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1980, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri Chaudhary Nuseem Ahmad, Station Road, Rae Bareli (Uttar Pradesh) as a Director of the New Bank of India for a period of three years commencing on the 8th day of March, 1982 and ending with the 7th day of March, 1985 to represent the interests of farmers.

[No. F. 9/41/81-BO.I]

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1982

का० आ० 1256 :—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक प्रधिनियम, 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 8 की उपधारा (4) के साथ पठित उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (क) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा आ० एम० बी० हाटे को उनके कार्यभार संभालने की तिथि से तीन वर्ष की प्रबंधि के लिए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के उप-गवर्नर के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एफ० 7/3/82-भी० घो०-1]

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1982

S.O. 1256.—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (1) read with sub-section (4) of section 8 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), the Central Government hereby appoints Dr. M. V. Hate as Deputy Governor of the Reserve Bank of India for a term of three years from the date of his taking charge.

[No. F. 7/3/82-B.O.I]

1	2	3	4
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबंधन) निधि		छोटा सिक्का	
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	1025,00,00,000	Small Coin	5,80,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि		वारीदे और भुजाए गए बिल	
National Agricultural Credit Stabilisation Fund	365,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
राष्ट्रीय शौचालिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबंधन) निधि		(क) देशी	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term operations) Fund	1625,00,00,000	(a) Internal	
जमाराशियोः—		(b) External	
Deposits:—		(c) सरकारी बजारा बिल	
(क) सरकारी		(c) Government Treasury Bills	1659,45,88,000
(a) Government		बिलें में रखा हुआ बकाया	1312,34,66,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	64,75,69,000	Balances Held Abroad*	
(i) Central Government		निवेश	
(ii) राज्य सरकारे	5,55,53,000	Investments**	3623,03,49,000
(ii) State Governments		ऋण और अग्रिम:—	
(ग) बैंक		Loans and Advances to:—	
(b) Banks		(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	4566,51,61,000	(i) Central Government	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks		(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	44,91,05,000	(ii) State Governments@	1106,67,68,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks		ऋण और अग्रिम:—	
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	3,81,29,000	Loans and Advances to:—	
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks		(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	5,06,23,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	622,48,41,000
(iv) Other Banks		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	
(ग) अन्य		(ii) State Co-operative Banks‡	602,76,12,000
(c) Others	1734,93,76,000	(iii) दूसरों को	
देश बिल		(iii) Others	8,45,86,000
Bills Payable	41,28,60,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबंधन) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
अन्य देयताएँ		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
Other Liabilities	2705,20,05,000	(क) ऋण और अग्रिम	
		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	
		(i) State Governments	127,97,67,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	32,10,89,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिक्षक बैंकों को	
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त और विकास निगम को	
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation	364,90,00,000
		(क) केन्द्रीय भूमिक्षक बैंकों के इन्डेबंडेंटों में निवेश	
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	4,63,25,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	98,49,08,000

1	2	3	4
		राष्ट्रीय श्रोतुओंगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबलंत) निधि से ऋण अधिस और निवेश Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(क)		(क) विकास बैंक की ऋण और अधिस (a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank 1443,99,40,000	
(ख)		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बांदों/दिवेंचरों में निवेश (b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	
		अन्य प्राप्तियाँ Other Assets	1261,59,21,000
	रुपये		रुपये
Rupees ..	12342,03,81,000		Rupees .. 12342,03,81,000

*तकदीर आवधिक जमा और अत्यकालीन प्रतिशुतियाँ शामिल हैं।

Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**राष्ट्रीयकृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबलंत) निधि और राष्ट्रीय ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबलंत) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबलंत) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अधिस शामिल नहीं हैं परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को दिये गये अस्थायी ओवरड्रॉफ्ट शामिल हैं।

Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

† भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम की धारा 17(4)(ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित बाणिज्य बैंकों की मीमांसा बिलों पर अधिस दिये गये रुपये शामिल हैं।
Includes Rs. Nil advanced to Scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

‡ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन प्रबलंत) निधि और राष्ट्रीयकृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अधिस शामिल नहीं हैं।

Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Sd/

उप-गवर्नर

Dy. Governor

विमांक

Dated the 30th day of December, 1981

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक
RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में 1981 के विनाक 25 विक्षम्बाह को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए सेवा
An Account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934 for the week ended the 25th day of December 1981

इण् डिपार्टमेंट

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

देयताएँ LIABILITIES	रुपए Rs.	रुपए Rs.	प्राप्तियाँ ASSETS	रुपए Rs.	रुपए Rs.
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट			सोने का मिक्का और बुनियात --		
Notes held in the Banking De- partment	64,02,59,000		Gold Coin and Bullion		
			(क) भारत में रखा हुआ		
			(a) Held in India	225,58,28,000	
संचलन में नोट			(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
Notes in circulation	14111,64,24,000		(b) Held outside India		
जारी की गए ब्रूल नोट			विदेशी प्रतिशुतियाँ		
Total Notes issued	14175,66,88,000		Foreign Securities	1964,05,75,000	
			जोड़		
			TOTAL		2189,64,03,000

कुल देयताएँ	रुपये का सिक्का	
Total Liabilities ..	Rupee Coin ..	41,11,46,
	भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिपूतियाँ	
	Government of India Rupee Securities.	11944,91,34,000
	देशी विभिन्न ब्रिस और इमरे वाणिज्य पत्र	
	Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper	
कुल आस्तियाँ	कुल आस्तियाँ	
Total Assets ..	Total Assets ..	14,175,66,83,000

दिनांक :
Dated the 30th day of December, 1981

P. R. Naugia
उप-गवर्नर

By Governor
चा० चा० मीरचंदनी, उप-गवर्नर
C. W. MIRCHANDANI Deputy Secretary

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 17 अगस्त, 1981

(आयकर)

का० आ० 1258.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इससे पूर्व आरी की गई सभी प्रधिसूचनाओं का अधिलंघन करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड, एलड्यूटा निवेश देता है कि सभी अनुदूषी के स्तम्भ तंत्रमा (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट आविकार-बोर्डों के आयकर आयुक्त (भीज), अनुदूषी के स्तम्भ (2) और (3) की तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविस्तियों में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर बाईं, परिमंडलों, जिलों और रेजियों में आयकर या अतिकर या आयज कर से निर्धारित ऐसे व्यक्तियों के बारे में, जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (क) से (ज), कम्पनी (साथ) अतिकर अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 7) की धारा 11 की उप-धारा (1) और आयज कर अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 45) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (1) में उल्लिखित किसी भी भारतीय देश से अपहृत हुए हैं और ऐसे व्यक्तियों या व्यक्ति वर्ग की बावत भी, जिनके लिए बोर्ड ने आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उप-धारा (2) के खण्ड (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसार निवेश दिया है या भविष्य में निवेश वें अपने कार्य का निर्वहण करेंगे।

अनुदूषी

मुख्यालय सहित अधि- कार कोशि	आयकर बाईं/परि- मंडल और जिले	निरीक्षी सहायक आयकर आयुक्त की रैंगें
(1)	(2)	(3)
आयकर आयुक्त (भीज)-I कानपुर मुख्यालय (आगरा में)	1. परिमंडल-II कानपुर (सभी बाईं) 2. परिमंडल-III, कानपुर (सभी बाईं) 3. सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल, कानपुर	1. आयकर आयुक्त, आयकर के भेदाधिकार के अंतर्गत आने वाली सभी रेजियों को छोड़कर आयकर
		2. आयुक्त (भीज)-II, कानपुर को सभी गयी रेजियों को छोड़कर आयकर

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|--|---|
| 4. कम्पनी परिमंडल, आयुक्त, कानपुर के बोर्ड-
बीजाई, कानपुर आविकार के अंतर्गत आने वाली सभी रेजियों | 5. सम्पदा शुल्क परिमंडल, कानपुर | 1. निरीक्षी सहायक आय-
कर आयुक्त, ए-रेजियो, कानपुर (सर्वेक्षण परि-
मंडलों को छोड़कर |
| 6. बेतन परिमंडल,
कानपुर (सभी बाईं) | 7. आयकर आयुक्त, आगरा के भेदाधिकार के अंतर्गत आने वाले सभी बाईं/परिमंडल | 2. निरीक्षी सहायक आय-
कर आयुक्त, भी-रेजियो, कानपुर (सम्पदा शुल्क और कम्पनी परिमंडल, भी-बीजाई, कानपुर जो भी छोड़कर) |
| 8. केन्द्रीय परिमंडल,
कानपुर (सभी बाईं) | 9. कम्पनी परिमंडल-ए-बाईं, कानपुर | 3. निरीक्षी सहायक आय-
कर आयुक्त, भी-रेजियो, कानपुर (सम्पदा शुल्क और कम्पनी परिमंडल, भी-बीजाई, कानपुर जो भी छोड़कर) |
| 10. विशेष परिमंडल,
कानपुर (सभी बाईं) | 11. वैडस परिमंडल | 4. निरीक्षी सहायक आय-
कर आयकर भी-रेजियो, कानपुर |
| | | 5. निरीक्षी सहायक आय-
कर आयकर भी-रेजियो, कानपुर |
| | | 6. आयकर आयुक्त केन्द्रीय कानपुर के भेदाधिकार के अंतर्गत आने वाली सभी रेजियों। |

यह: जो कोई आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड आयकर जिला अधिकार उसका कोई भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक अधिकार-क्षेत्र से किसी आय अधिकार क्षेत्र में प्रतिनिधित्व कर दिया गया है, यह: उस आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड या उसके किसी भाग या जिले में किए गए निष्ठारिणी से उत्पन्न होने वाली और उस अधिकार-क्षेत्र के जिसमें वह आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका कोई भाग अंतरित हुआ है, आकर आयुक्त के समझ इस अधिसूचना की तारीख के तर्काल पहले असिरिणी पढ़ी अपीले, जिसके अधिकार-क्षेत्र से आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया हो, इस अधिसूचना के लागू होने की तारीख से आयकर आयुक्त को अंतरित वीजाएं और उसके हारा निपटाई जाएंगी, जिसके अधिकार-क्षेत्र में उक्त परिमंडल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया जाए।

यह अधिसूचना 24 अगस्त, 1981 से लागू होगी।

[सं. 4168/फा. सं. 261/81 भांक०म्या०]

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 17th August, 1981

(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 1258.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 121-A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of all notifications issued earlier, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Commissioner of Incometax (Appeals) of the charges specified in column No. (1) of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of such persons assessed to Income-tax or Sur-tax or Interest Tax in the Income-tax Wards, Circles, Districts and Ranges specified in the corresponding entries in columns (2) and (3) thereof, as are aggrieved by any of the orders mentioned in clauses (a) to (b) of sub-section (2) of section 246 of the Incometax Act, 1961 in sub-section (1) of section 11 of Companies (Profits) Surtax Act, 1964 (7 of 1964) and in sub-section (1) of section 15 of the Interest Tax Act, 1974 (45 of 1974) and also in respect of such persons or clauses of persons as the Board has directed or may direct in future in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of sub-section (2) of section 246 of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

SCHEDULE

Charges with headquarters	Incometax Ward/Circles and Districts	Ranges of inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax
(1)	(2)	(3)
Commissioner of Incometax (Appeals)-I Kanpur (H.Q. at Agra)	1. Circle-II, Kanpur (All wards) 2. Circle-III, Kanpur (All wards) 3. Survey Circles, Ward, Kanpur 4. Company Circle, Ward, Kanpur 5. Estate Duty Circles, Kanpur 6. Salary Circle, Kanpur (all wards) 7. All Wards/Circles within the jurisdiction of CIT, Agra	1. All ranges within the jurisdiction of Commissioner of Income-tax, Agra. 2. All ranges within the jurisdiction of Commissioner of Income-tax, Kanpur excluding those assigned to Commissioner (Appeals)-II, Kanpur.
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-II, Kanpur	1. Circle-I, Kanpur (all wards) 2. Central Circles, Kanpur (all wards)	1. Inspecting Assistant 2. Special Circle, Kanpur (all wards)

(1)	(2)	(3)
3. Company Circle, A Ward, Kanpur	A Range, Kanpur (excepting survey circles).	4. Special Circle, Kanpur (all wards)
5. Bands Circle.	2. Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Incometax	B Range, Kanour (excepting Estate Duty and Company Circles B Ward, Kanpur).
	3. Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Incometax (Asst.) Range I, Kanpur.	4. Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Incometax (Asst.) Range II, Kanpur.
	5. Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Incometax D Range, Kanpur.	6. All Ranges within the jurisdiction of Commissioner of Incometax (Central), Kanpur.

Whereas the Incometax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one charge to another charge, appeals arising out of the assessments made in that Incometax Circle, Ward or part thereof or District and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Commissioner of Incometax of the charge from whom the Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred, shall from the date of this notification takes effect, be transferred and dealt with by the Commissioner of Incometax of the charge to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 24-8-1981.

[No. 4168/F. No. 261/8/81-ITJ]

नई विल्सी 26 अगस्त, 1981

भांक०म्या० 1259.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121-क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस सम्बन्ध में सभी पूर्ववर्ती आदेशों का अधिलंबन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एवं द्वारा निवेश देता है कि आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) केन्द्रीय-I और II कलकत्ता, प्रबुसुक्षी के स्तंभ (2) और (3) की तदनुस्ती प्रतिविष्ट आयकर वार्ड, परिमंडल, जिला और रेजों में आयकर या अधिकार या आज कर से निर्धारित ऐसे व्यक्तियों के बारे में, जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246

की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (क) से (ज), कम्पनी (साम) अधिकार प्रविधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 7) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) और व्यापक कर प्रविधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 45) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (1) में उल्लिखित किसी भी भाद्रेश से उपकृत हुए हैं और ऐसे अधिकारीयों या अधिकारीयों की बाबत भी, जिनके लिए बोर्ड ने आयकर प्रविधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (1) के उपबन्धों के अनुसार निरेश दिया है या भविष्य में निर्देश दें आपने कार्य निर्वहण करेंगे।

मुख्यालय सहित अधिकार-क्षेत्र	आयकर धार्ड और परिमंडल	निरोक्षी सहायक आयकर भायुक्त के रेज
(1)	(2)	(3)
आयकर भायुक्त (प्रपील) (ग-I), कलकत्ता	आयकर केन्द्रीय परिमंडल III/V/VI/VII/ IX/XX/XXIII/ XXVII/XXVIII/ XXIX/XXX पोर कटक XXXI/ XXXII/XXXIII/ XXXIV, कलकत्ता I, II	1. रेज-1 (सी), कलकत्ता। 2. रेज-2(सी), कलकत्ता। 3. रेज-V (सी), कलकत्ता। 4. कर-निर्धारण, रेज ए-(सेन्ट्रल), कलकत्ता। 5. कर निर्धारण, रेज सी (सेन्ट्रल), कलकत्ता। 6. कर निर्धारण, रेज 'सी' (सेन्ट्रल), कल- कत्ता।
आयकर भायुक्त प्रपील (सी-II), कलकत्ता	आयकर केन्द्रीय परि- मंडल, कलकत्ता X/XI/ XII/XIII/XV/ XVI/XVII/ XVIII/XIX/XXI/ XXII/XXIV/ XXV/IV/XIV/ XXVI	1. रेज-III (सी), कलकत्ता। 2. रेज-IV (सी), कलकत्ता। 3. रेज-VI (सी), कलकत्ता। 4. कर 'निर्धारण, रेज 'सी' (सी), कलकत्ता।

यह प्रधिसूचना 25 अगस्त, 1981 से लागू होगी।

[सं. 4192/फा. सं. 261/17/81-आ०क०स्था०]

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1981

S.O. 1259.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 321A of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of all earlier orders in this regard, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) Central I & II, Calcutta shall perform their functions in respect of such persons assessed to Incometax or Surtax or Interest Tax in the Income tax Wards, Circles, Districts and Ranges specified in the corresponding entries in column (2) and column (3) thereof, as are aggrieved by any of the orders mentioned in clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income Tax Act, 1961, in sub-section (d) of section 11 of Companies (Profits) Surtax Act, 1964 (7 of 1964) and in sub-section (1) of section 15 of the Interest Tax Act, 1974 (45 of 1974) and also in respect of such persons or classes of persons as the Board has directed or may direct in future in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of sub-section (2) of Section 246 of the Income Tax Act, 1961.

Charges with Headquarters	Incometax Wards and Circles	Ranges of Inspecting Assistant Com- missioner of Income Tax
(1)	(2)	(3)
C.I.T. (Appeals) (C-I), Calcutta	IT Central Circle, Col.I/II/III/V/VI/	1. Range-I (C), Calcutta

1	2	3
C.I.T. (Appeals) (C-II), Calcutta	IT Central Circle Col. X/XI/XII/XIII/ XV/XVI/XVII/ XVIII/XIX/XXI/ XXII/XXIV/XXV/ IV/XIV/XXVI	1. Range-2(C), Calcutta. 3. Range-V(C), Calcutta. 4. Asstt. Range A (Central), Calcutta. 5. Asstt. Range C (Central), Calcutta. 6. Asstt. Range D (Central), Calcutta.
		1. Range III(C), Calcutta. 2. Range IV (C), Calcutta. 3. Range VI (C), Calcutta. 4. Asstt. Range 'B' (C), Calcutta.

This Notification takes effect from 25-8-81.

[No. 4192/F. No. 261/17/81-ITJ]

मई विस्ती, 31 अगस्त, 1981

(आयकर)

का० ३० १२६०.—आयकर प्रविधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और दिनांक 12 नवम्बर, 1980 की अधिसूचना संख्या 3724 (का० सं० 261/31/80-आ० क० न्या०) का अधिवलंबन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्षकर बोर्ड, एतद्वारा निरेश देता है कि निम्नलिखित अनुमूलीकी के संघ (1) में विनियिष्ट रेज के अपीलीय सहायक आयकर भायुक्त आयकर से निर्धारित उन सभी अधिकारीयों और आय को छोड़ कर जिन पर प्रधिकारिता आयकर भायुक्त (प्रपील) में निहित है, अनुमूलीकी के संघ (2) की तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविटि में विनियिष्ट आयकर परिमंडलों, वार्डों और जिलों में आयकर से निर्धारित ऐसे सभी अधिकारीयों और आय से सम्बन्धित कार्य करेगा:

मुख्यालय सहित रेज	आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड और जिले
(1)	(2)
1. अपीलीय सहायक आयकर भायुक्त, बंगलौर रेज-I, बंगलौर	1. परिमंडल I, बंगलौर।
2. आयकर प्रधिकारी, विदेश अनु- मान, बंगलौर।	2. आयकर प्रधिकारी, व्यायाम परि- मंडल, बंगलौर।
3. कम्पनी परिमंडल-I से VI तक, बंगलौर।	3. वेतन परिमंडल, बंगलौर।
4. वेतन परिमंडल, बंगलौर।	5. आयकर प्रधिकारी, व्यायाम परि- मंडल, बंगलौर।
5. पुराने बंगलौर परिमंडल के आयकर प्रधिकारीयों द्वारा पारित आवेदों की बाबत।	6. पुराने बंगलौर परिमंडल के आयकर प्रधिकारीयों द्वारा पारित आवेदों की बाबत।
7. आयकर प्रधिकारी, चन्नापाटन द्वारा पारित आवेदों की बाबत।	7. आयकर प्रधिकारी, चन्नापाटन द्वारा पारित आवेदों की बाबत।
8. बंगलौर परिमंडल, बंगलौर।	8. बंगलौर परिमंडल, बंगलौर।
9. उदीपी परिमंडल, उदीपी।	9. उदीपी परिमंडल, उदीपी।
10. सम्बद्ध शूलक और आयकर परिमंडल, बंगलौर।	10. सम्बद्ध शूलक और आयकर परिमंडल, बंगलौर।

(1)	(2)
	1. सम्पदा शुल्क और प्रायकर परिमंडल, बंगलोर।
2. अपीलीय सहायक प्रायकर आयुक्त, बंगलोर रेंज-II, बंगलोर	1. परिमंडल-II, बंगलोर। 2. विशेष सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल, बंगलोर। 3. मैसूर परिमंडल, मैसूर। 4. मोडपा परिमंडल, मोडपा। 5. हसन परिमंडल, हसन। 6. कुण परिमंडल, हेरकारा। 7. विकासगढ़ परिमंडल, विकासगढ़।
3. अपीलीय सहायक प्रायकर आयुक्त, बंगलोर रेंज-III, बंगलोर	1. परिमंडल III, बंगलोर। 2. केंद्रीय परिमंडल-I,II,III, IV और V बंगलोर। 3. कोलार परिमंडल, कोलार। 4. दुमकुर परिमंडल, दुमकुर। 1. हुबली परिमंडल, हुबली। 2. वारवाड परिमंडल, वारवाड। 3. गुडग परिमंडल, गुडग। 4. शिमोगा परिमंडल, शिमोगा। 5. रायबूर परिमंडल, रायबूर। 6. गुलबारी परिमंडल, गुलबारी। 7. बेलारी परिमंडल, बेलारी। 8. होस्टेट परिमंडल, होस्टेट। 9. चिन्नुग परिमंडल, चिन्नुग। 10. बावनगेरे परिमंडल, बावनगेरे। 11. बेलगाम परिमंडल, बेलगाम। 12. बीजापुर परिमंडल, बीजापुर। 13. बगलकोट परिमंडल, बगलकोट। 1. पणजी परिमंडल, पणजी। 2. मारगांधी परिमंडल, मारगांधी। 3. कारवार परिमंडल, कारवार।
4. अपीलीय सहायक प्रायकर आयुक्त, धारवाह रेंज, दुबली	
5. अपीलीय सहायक प्रायकर आयुक्त, पणजी रेंज, पणजी	

मतः, जहाँ कोई प्रायकर परिमंडल, वार्ड प्रथमा जिला प्रथमा उसका कोई भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक रेंज से किसी भयं रेंज में प्रतिरित कर दिया गया हो, या, मतः वहाँ उस प्रायकर परिमंडल, वार्ड प्रथमा जिले प्रथमा उसके किसी भाग में किए गए कर निर्धारणों के विषय दायर की गई और इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से तुरन्त पहले रेंज के उस अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त के समक्ष विचाराधीन पड़ी अपीलें जिसके अधिकार धैर्य से प्रायकर परिमंडल प्रथमा जिला प्रथमा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया हो, इस अधिसूचना के लागू होने की तारीख से रेंज के उस अपीलीय सहायक प्रायुक्त को प्रतिरित की जाएगी और उसके द्वारा निपटाई जाएगी, जिसके अधिकार-धैर्य में उक्त परिमंडल, वार्ड प्रथमा जिला प्रथमा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया है।

यह अधिसूचना 15 सितम्बर, 1981 से लागू होगी।
[सं. 4197/फा० सं. 261/18/81-प्रा०का० न्या०]

New Delhi, the 31st August, 1981
(INCOME TAX)

S.O. 1260.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of Notification No. 3724 (F. No. 261/31/80-ITD), dated 12-11-1980, the Central Board of Direct Taxes

hereby directs that Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the Ranges specified in column (1) of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to Income tax in the Income tax Circle, Wards & Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) thereof, excluding all persons and incomes assessed to Income tax over which the jurisdiction vests in Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) :

SCHEDULE

Range with Headquarters	Income-tax Circle, Ward and Districts
(1)	(2)
1. Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Incometax, Bangalore Range I, Bangalore	1. Circle-I, Bangalore. 2. Incometax Officer, Foreign Section, Bangalore. 3. Company Circle I to VI, Bangalore. 4. Salary Circle, Bangalore. 5. Incometax Officer, Trust Circle, Bangalore. 6. In respect of orders passed by Income-tax Officers, Bangalore Circle, old. 7. In respect of orders passed by the Incometax Officer Channapatna. 8. Bangalore Circle, Mangalore. 9. Udupi Circle, Udupi. 10. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Bangalore. 11. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Mangalore. 12. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Hubli.
2. Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Incometax, Bangalore Range II, Bangalore	1. Circle-II, Bangalore. 2. Special Survey Circle, Bangalore. 3. Mysore Circle, Mysore. 4. Mandya Circle, Mandya. 5. Hassan Circle, Hassan. 6. Coorg Circle, Mercara. 7. Chikmagalur Circle, Chikmagalur.
3. Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Bangalore Range III, Bangalore	1. Circle III, Bangalore. 2. Central Circle-I, II, III, IV & V, Bangalore. 3. Kollar Circle, Kolar. 4. Tumkur Circle, Tumkur. 1. Hubli Circle, Hubli. 2. Dharwar Circle, Dharwar. 3. Gadag Circle, Gadag. 4. Shimoga Circle, Shimoga. 5. Raichur Circle, Raichur. 6. Gulbarga Circle, Gulbarga. 7. Bellary Circle, Bellary. 8. Hospet Circle, Hospet. 9. Chitradurga Circle, Chitradurga. 10. Davangere Circle, Davangere.
4. Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Incometax, Dharwar Range, Hubli	11. Belgaum Circle, Belgaum. 12. Bijapur Circle, Bijapur. 13. Bagalkot Circle, Bagalkot. 1. Panaji Circle, Panaji. 2. Margao Circle, Margao. 3. Karwar Circle, Kharwar,
5. Appellate Assistant Commissioneer of Incometax Panaji Range, Paujji	

Whereas the Income tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range, as appeals arising out of the assessments made in that Income tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom that Income tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from this date of the Notification take effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward, District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 15-9-1981.

[No. 4197(F. No. 261/18/81-ITJ)]

नई दिल्ली, 3 सितम्बर, 1981

आयकर

का०खा० 1261.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर और, एततुद्वारा निरेण देता है कि विनाक 12 मध्यम्बर, 1980 की अधिसूचना संख्या 3726 (फा० सं० 261/12/80-पा०क० न्या०) की अनुसूची में अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, ए-रेज, इन्दौर के सामने कम सं० 1 पर और कम सं० 18 तक पर स्तंभ सं० (2) के लिये निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाएगा :

“18 वा आयकर अधिकारी, विशेष जांच परिमंडल-4, इन्दौर” यह अधिसूचना 1 सितम्बर, 1981 से लागू होगी।

[संख्या 4204 (फा० सं० 261/13/81-पा०क० न्या०)]

New Delhi, the 3rd September, 1981

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 1261.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (45 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby directs that in the schedule to the Notification No. 3726 (F. No. 261/12/80-ITJ) dated 12th November, 1980 at Sl. No. 1 against the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, A-Range, Indore and below column No. (2) at Sl. No. 18B, the following shall be added :

“18B. ITO, Special Investigation Circle-IV, Indore.” This notification shall take effect from 1-9-1981.

[No. 4204/F. No. 261/13/81-ITJ]

नई दिल्ली, 4 सितम्बर, 1981

आयकर

का०खा० 1262.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस सम्बन्ध में सभी पूर्ववर्ती अधिसूचनाओं का अधिलंबन करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर और एततुद्वारा निरेण देता है कि भीजे की बी गई अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिविष्ट रेंजों के अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, आयकर से निर्वाचित उन सभी व्यक्तियों और आय की छोड़कर जिन पर आधिकारिता आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) में निहित है, अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (3) में तत्सम्बन्धी प्रोक्रेटिं में विनिविष्ट आयकर परिमंडलों, वार्डों और जिलों में आयकर से निर्वाचित ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों और आय से सम्बन्धित कार्य करेगा :

अनुसूची

कम सं० अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त की आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड और जिला रेज

1	2	3
1. अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, ए-रेज, हैदराबाद	1. परिमंडल-III, हैदराबाद	
	2. करीमनगर	
	3. खामोश	
	4. परिमंडल-IV, हैदराबाद	

1	2	3
2. अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त श्री-रेज, हैदराबाद	1. बेसन परिमंडल, हैदराबाद	
	2. निजामाबाद	
	3. निरमल	
	4. सर्वेश्वर परिमंडल हैदराबाद	
	5. विशेष जांच परिमंडल, हैदराबाद	
	6. महबूबनगर	
	7. बारामंडल	
	8. सोनेपट्टी	
	9. परिमंडल-II, हैदराबाद	
	10. विशेष परिमंडल, हैदराबाद	
3. अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, सीमा शुल्क रेज, हैदराबाद	1. कम्पनी परिमंडल, हैदराबाद	
	2. परियोजना परिमंडल, हैदराबाद	
	3. केन्द्रीय परिमंडल-I, हैदराबाद	
	4. केन्द्रीय परिमंडल-II, हैदराबाद	
	5. केन्द्रीय परिमंडल-III, हैदराबाद	
	6. नालगोडा	
	7. सम्बा शुल्क परिमंडल, हैदराबाद	
	8. सम्बा शुल्क परिमंडल, काकीनाडा	
	9. सम्बा शुल्क परिमंडल, गुट्टुर	
	10. सम्बा शुल्क परिमंडल, अनंतपुर	
	11. परिमंडल-1, हैदराबाद	
4. अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, विजयवाडा रेज, विजयवाडा	1. विजयवाडा	
	2. मुस्लि, दहनम	
	3. तेलांगा	
	4. गुड्डीवाडा	
	5. नेल्लोर	
	6. ओंगोल	
	7. बापटला	
	8. गुट्टुर	
	9. केन्द्रीय परिमंडल, विजयवाडा	
	10. राजामुद्री	
	11. पालाकोल	
	12. तेलाकू	
	13. भीमवरम	
5. अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त विशाखापत्नम	1. एसूर	
	2. आमालपुरम	
	3. विशाखापत्नम	
	4. विजयनगरम	
	5. मनकापुरम	
	6. भेकाकुपम	
	7. केन्द्रीय परिमंडल, काकीनाडा	
	8. परिमंडल-1, काकीनाडा	
	9. परिमंडल-11, काकीनाडा	
6. अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयुक्त, अनंतपुर	1. अनंतपुर	
	2. हिन्दूपुर	
	3. कुड्डपा	
	4. परोहत्तुर	
	5. तिशपत्ती	
	6. वित्तोड़	
	7. गड्ढोनी	
	8. कुरुक्कुल	
	9. नोदियाल	

यह, जहाँ कोई आयकर परिमंडल, बाईं अथवा जिन अथवा उसका कोई भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक रेंज से किसी अन्य रेंज में अंतरित कर दिया गया हो अतः वहाँ उस आयकर परिमंडल, बाईं अथवा जिन अथवा उसके किसी भाग में किए गए करनिवारणों के विवर वायर की गई और इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से तुरन्त पहले, रेंज के उस अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त के समक्ष विवादार्थीन पहुँच अपीले, जिसके अधिकार-सेवा से आयकर परिमंडल अथवा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया हो, इस अधिसूचना के लागू होने की तारीख से रेंज के उस अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त को अंतरित की जाएगी और उसके द्वारा निपटाई जाएगी, जिसके अधिकार-सेवा में उक्त परिमंडल, बाईं अथवा जिला अथवा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया है।

यह अधिसूचना 15 सितम्बर, 1981 से लागू होगी।

आयामात्तक विषय: अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, बी-रेंज, हैदराबाद और फाकोनाडा की समाप्ति के कारण आंशिक प्रदेश और विवादार्थकार के पुनः आवंटन के कारण संबोधन स्थापयक हो गए हैं। यह दिनों अधिसूचना का भाग नहीं है लेकिन इसे केवल स्पष्ट करना अभीष्ट है।

[सं० 4208 (फा० सं० 261/17/81-पा० क०स्था०)]

New Delhi, the 4th September, 1981

INCOME-TAX

S.O.1262.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of all the previous notifications in this regard the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby directs that Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income tax of the Ranges specified in column (2) of the Schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and income assessed to Income tax in the Income tax Circle, wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) thereof excluding all persons and incomes assessed to Income tax over which the jurisdiction vests in Commissioner of Income tax (Appeals).

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner's Range	Income tax Circle, Ward and District.
1	2	3
1.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income tax, A-Range, Hyderabad.	1. Circle-III, Hyd. 2. Karimnagar. 3. Khammam. 4. Circle-IV, Hyd.
2.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income tax, B-Range, Hyderabad.	1. Salary Circle, Hyd. 2. Nizamabad. 3. Nirmal 4. Survey Circle, Hyd. 5. Spl. Inv. Cir, Hyd. 6. Mahaboob Nagar. 7. Warangal 8. Sangareddy 9. Circle-II, Hyd. 10. Sp. Cir, Hyd.
3.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income tax, ED-Range, Hyderabad.	1. Company Circle, Hyd. 2. Project Circle, Hyd. 3. Central Circle-I, Hyd. 4. Central Circle-II, Hyd. 5. Central Circle-III, Hyd. 6. Nalgonda. 7. ED. Circle, Hyd.

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|--|---|--|
| 4. Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Vijayawada Range, | Vijayawada. | 8. ED. Circle, Kakinada.
9. ED. Circle Guntur.
10. ED. Circle, Ananthapur
11. Circle-I, Hyd. |
| Vijayawada. | 1. Vijayawada.
2. M.chilipatnam.
3. Tenali.
4. Gudiywada
5. Nellore
6. Ongole
7. Baptla
8. Guntur
9. Central Cir, Vij ynagar.
10. Rajahmundry. | 12. Palacole
13. Tanuku
13. Bhimavaram. |
| 5. Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Visakhapatnam. | 1. Eluru.
2. Amilipuram.
3. Visakhapatnam.
4. Vijyanagaram.
5. Anakapalli.
6. Srikakulam
7. Central Cir, Kakinada
8. Cir-I, Kakinada
9. Cir-II, Kakinada. | 6. Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, Ananthapur. |
| | 1. Ananthapur.
2. Hindupur.
3. Cuddapah.
4. Proddapur.
5. Tirupati
6. Chittoor.
7. Adoni.
8. Kurnool
9. Nandyal. | 1. Ananthapur.
2. Hindupur.
3. Cuddapah.
4. Proddapur.
5. Tirupati
6. Chittoor.
7. Adoni.
8. Kurnool
9. Nandyal. |

Whereas Income-tax Circle; award or District or part thereof stands transferred by this Notification from one Range, to another Range, Appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax circle, ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax of this Range from which the Income-tax circle, ward or District or part thereof is transferred, shall from the date of this notification takes effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax of the Range to whom the said circle, ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 15-9-1981.

Explanatory Note:—The assessments have become necessary on account of re-allocation of jurisdiction of the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of income-tax in the charges of Andhra Pradesh and Vishakhapatnam also due to abolition of A. C. A-Range Hyderabad and Kakinada.

(This note does not form part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory)

[No. 4208/F. No. 261/17/81-ITJ]

मई दिल्ली, 18 सितम्बर, 1982

आयाम

का० आ० 1263.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की भारा 122 की उप-भारा (1) भारा प्रवत्त मकानों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इस सम्बन्ध में सभी पूर्ववर्ती अधिसूचनाओं का अधिलंघन करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एवं द्वारा निदेश देता है कि भीचे अनुसूची के संबंध (1) में विनिविष्ट अपीलीय सहायक आयकर आयकर और रेंज आयकर से निर्धारित उन सभी व्यक्तियों और पाय को छोड़कर जिन पर आधिकृता आयकर आयुक्त (मपील) में निहित

६. भ्रष्टाचारी के तथा (2) की तसव्वुओं परिमेंडलों, वार्ड और जिलों में आयकर से नियमित ऐसे सभी अधिकारी और आय से सम्बन्धित काम करेगा।

भ्रष्टाचारी

क्रम सं.	रेंज	आयकर परिमेंडल/वार्ड/जिले
1.	प्राप्तीलीय सहायक आयुक्त पटि- याला रेंज, पटियाला	सभी आयकर परिमेंडल, वार्ड और जिले जिनके सुविधालय (1) बाड़ी और जिलों (2) बरताला (3) पटि- याला (4) रोपह (5) संगहर (6) केंद्रीय परिमेंडल पटियाला (7) पटियाला लिप्त विशेष आय परिमेंडल, और (8) मलेर कोटला में है।
2.	प्राप्तीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, ए- रेंज, लुधियाना	जिला I (1) } जिला I (5) } जिला I (6) } सुधियाना जिला I (7) } जिला II (5) } बाड़ी (6) } जिला II (7) } जिला II (8) } विशेष सर्वेक्षण परि- मेंडल 1 से 6 तक } } लुधियाना
3.	प्राप्तीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, बी- रेंज, लालियाना	जिला I (2) } जिला I (3) } जला I (4) } सुधियाना जिला II (1) } जिला II (2) } जिला II (3) } जिला II (4) } केंद्रीय परिमेंडल 1 से 6 सुधियाना विशेष आय परिमेंडल, लुधियाना
4.	प्राप्तीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, चंडी- गढ़ रेंज, चंडीगढ़	(1) चंडीगढ़ (2) आयकर परिमेंडल चम्बा, कांगड़ा, हरिहरपुर और पालम- पुर का जला जिला (3) मंडी (4) केंद्रीय परिमेंडल, चंडीगढ़ (5) विशेष आय परिमेंडल, चंडीगढ़ (6) शिमला (7) सोलन

(परन्तु समाप्त कर दिए गए बाब्द, जिने और परिमेंडल के बारे में कोई अधिकार भी उन्हीं नियमित आयकरों के पास हीं जिनका उन परि-
मेंडलों, बाड़ी और जिलों पर अब आवाधिकार है जिनके पास इन परिमेंडलों, बाड़ी और जिलों के भागों की अवृत्त नियमित किया जाता है।)

इति, जहाँ कोई आयकर परिमेंडल, वार्ड अथवा जिला उसका कोई भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक रेंज से किया जाये रेंज में अंतरित कर दिया गया है, अतः वहाँ उस आयकर परिमेंडल, वार्ड अथवा जिले अथवा उसके किसी भाग में किए गए कर नियमितों के विशेष आयकर की गई और इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से तुरन्त पहले, रेंज के उस प्राप्तीलीय सहायक आयुक्त के समक्ष विचाराधीन पड़ी अपीलें, जिसके प्रधिकार-सेवा से आयकर परिमेंडल अथवा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया हो। इस अधिसूचना के लागू होने की तारीख से रेंज के उस प्राप्तीलीय सहायक आयुक्त की अन्तरित की जाएगी और उनके द्वारा निपटायी जावेगी जिसके प्रधिकार-सेवा में उक्त परिमेंडल, वार्ड अथवा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया है।

जहाँ किसी व्यावर विशेष पर स्थित सुविधालय वा उसी परिमेंडल, बाड़ी और जिले प्राप्तीलीय सहायक आयुक्त को सौंपे गये हैं, इन सुविधालयों पर स्थित समाप्त कर दिये जाये परिमेंडलों, बाड़ी और जिलों के बारे में, भी उसका आवाधिकार होगा।

मह. अधिसूचना 14 सितम्बर, 1981 से लागू होगी।

[सं. 4219/261/10/81-प्रा० क० आ०)]

New Delhi, the 18th September, 1981

INCOME-TAX

S.O.1263.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (i) of Section 122 of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of all the previous notifications in this behalf, the Central Board of Direct taxes, hereby direct that Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax & the Ranges specified in column (1) of the Schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and income assessed to Income-tax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) thereof excluding all persons and incomes assessed to Income-tax over which the jurisdiction vests in commissioners of Income-tax (Appeals).

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Range	Income tax Circles/Wards/ Districts.
1.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner, Patiala Range, Patiala.	All Income tax Circles, Wards and Districts, having Head- quarters at : (i) Khanna (ii) Barnala (iii) Patiala (iv) Ropar (v) Sangrur (vi) Central Circle, Patiala (vii) Special Investigation Circles at Patiala, & (viii) Malerkotla.
2.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner, A-Range Ludhiana.	Distt. I (1) Distt. I (5) Distt. I(6) Distt. I(7) Distt. II(5) & (6) Distt. II(7) Distt. II(8) Spl. survey Circles I to VI. } Located at Ludhiana
3.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner, B-Range, Ludhiana.	Distt. I(2) Distt. I(3) Distt. I(4) Distt. II(1) Distt. II(2) Distt. II(3) Distt. II(4) } Located at Ludhiana.
4.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner Chandigarh Range, Chandigarh.	(i) Chandigarh (ii) Income tax Circle Chamba, Kangra, Hamirpur and Una District of Palampur. (iii) Mandi. (iv) Central Circle, Chandigarh. (v) Spl. Investigation Circle, Chandigarh. (vi) Simla. (vii) Solan.

Central Circle I to VI Ludhiana Spl.
Investigation Circle, Ludhi-
ana.

(Provided that jurisdiction in respect of Wards, Districts and Circles which have been abolished would also lie with the A.A.Cs who have present jurisdiction over Circles, Wards and Districts with whom the cases of these Circles, Wards and Districts are presently assessed.)

Whereas the Income tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this Notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of the assessments made in that Income tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from the date of this Notification takes effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

Where all circles, wards and Districts having Headquarter at a particular place have been assigned to an Appellate Assistant Commissioner, he will have jurisdiction in respect of Circles, Wards and Districts at these Headquarters since abolished also.

This Notification shall take effect from 14-9-1981.

[No. 4219 (261)/10/81 I.T.J.]

का०आ० 1264.—बोर्ड को विनांक 30 अक्टूबर, 1980 की प्रधिसूचना संख्या 3781 (फा० सं० 261/27/80-प्रा० क० न्या०) में घनुसूची के स्तर 2 के प्रत्यंत फम सं० 5 और 6 पर 'शिमला' और 'सोलन' परिमंडलों की अपेक्षीय सहायक आवृक्त, घम्बाला के क्षेत्राधिकार से निकाल यित्रा जाएगा और घम्बाला रेंज, घम्बाला के सामने स्तर 2 में मौजूदा प्रविधियों को (1) से (5) तक पुः संवर्धित किया जाएगा।

2. यह प्रधिसूचना 14 सितम्बर, 1981 से लागू होगी।

[संख्या 4220 फा०/सं० 261/10/81-प्रा० क० न्या०]

अजय सिंह, भवर सचिव

S.O. 1264.—In the Board's Notification No. 3781 (F. No. 261/27/80-ITJ) dated 30-10-1980 'Simla' and 'Solan' Circles at S. Nos 5 and 6 under Col. 2 of the Schedule shall be deleted from the jurisdiction of A.A.C. Ambala and the existing entries in Col. 2 against Ambala Range, Ambala shall be renumbered (i) to (v).

2. This notification shall take effect from 14-9-1981.

[No. 4220/F. No. 261/10/81-ITJ]

AJAI SINGH, Under Secy.

मई विल्ली, 16 अक्टूबर, 1981

का०आ० 1265.—केन्द्रीय प्रश्नकार बोर्ड, आयकर भविनियम, 1961 ('1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) धारा प्रदत्त प्रविधियों का प्रयोग करते हुए समय समय पर यथासंशोधित घपनी प्रधिसूचना सं० 679, तारीख 20 जुलाई, 1974 से संलग्न घनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है:

कम सं० 16 और 16के सामने स्तरम् 1, 2 और 3 की विद्यमान प्रविधियों का निम्नलिखित रूप से संशोधन किया जाएगा—

आयकर घायुक्त	मुख्यालय	प्रधिकारिता
1	2	3
16 केन्द्रीय-1	मद्रास	(i) केन्द्रीय सकिल I, II, III, IV, V, XIV, XV, XVI, मद्रास (ii) केन्द्रीय सकिल I और II, कोइम्बटूर (iii) केन्द्रीय सकिल I, और II मद्रास
16के केन्द्रीय-2	मद्रास	केन्द्रीय सकिल VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, और XVII, मद्रास

मध्य अधिसूचना 17-10-81 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 4266/फा० सं० 187/29/81-प्रा० क० न्या० (ए० प्रा०)]

New Delhi, the 16th October, 1981

S.O. 1265.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the schedule appended to its notification No. 679 (F. No. 187/2/74-IT(AI) dated the 20th July, 1974 as amended from time to time.

Existing entries under Col. (1)(2) and (3) against Sl. No. 16 shall be substituted by the following entries, the following entries shall be added to the schedule at Sl. No. 16A.

Commissioner of Income Tax	Headquarters	Jurisdiction
16. CIT Central-I, Madras.	Madras	(i) Central Circles, I, II, III, IV, V, XIV, XV, XVI, Madras. (ii) Central Circle I and II, Coimbatore. (iii) Central Circles I & II, Madurai.
16A. CIT Central-II, Madras	Madras	Central Circles VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII, and XVII, Madras.

This notification shall take effect from 17-10-81.

[No. 4266/F. No. 187/29/81-IT (AI)]

मई विल्ली, विनांक 28 दिसम्बर, 1981

का०आ० 1266.—केन्द्रीय प्रश्नकार बोर्ड आयकर भविनियम, 1961 ('1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) धारा प्रदत्त प्रविधियों का प्रयोग करते हुए समय समय पर यथासंशोधित घपनी प्रधिसूचना सं० 679, तारीख 20 जुलाई, 1974 से संलग्न घनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है।

कम सं० 16 और 16के सामने स्तरम् 1, 2 और 3 की विद्यमान प्रविधियों का निम्नलिखित रूप में संशोधन किया जाएगा—

आयकर घायुक्त	मुख्यालय	प्रधिकारिता
1	2	3
16. केन्द्रीय-1	मद्रास	(i) केन्द्रीय सकिल I, II, III, IV, V, XI, XIV, XVI, मद्रास (ii) केन्द्रीय सकिल I और II, कोइम्बटूर (iii) केन्द्रीय I और II, मद्रास
16के केन्द्रीय-2	मद्रास	केन्द्रीय सकिल VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIII और XVII, मद्रास

महाभिसूचना 1 जनवरी, 1982 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 4400/फा० सं० 187/29/81-प्राई० टी० (एमाइ०)]
वी० बी० श्रीनिवासन, मण्डिल

New Delhi, the 28th December, 1981

S.O. 1266.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendments to the schedule appended to its Notification No. 679 dated 20th July, 1974 as amended from time to time.

Existing entries under Column 1, 2 and 3 against Sl. No. 16 and 16A shall be amended as follows :—

Commissioner of Income Tax	Headquarters	Jurisdiction
1	2	3
16. Central-I, Madras	Madras	(i) Central Circles, I, II, III, IV, V, XI, XIV, XV, XVI, Madras. (ii) Central Circles, I II, Coimbatore. (iii) Central Circles, I & II, Madurai.
16A. Central-II, Madras	Madras	Central Circles, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XII, XIII and XVII, Madras.

This Notification shall take effect from 1st January, 1982.

[No. 4400/F. No. 187/29/81-IT (AI)]
V. B. SRINIVASAN, Secy.

(समाहृतालय केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क तथा सीमा गुम्बः मध्य प्रदेश)

भ्रिसूचना सं० 3/82

इंदौर, 4 मार्च, 1982

S.O. 1267.—अधीक्षक केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समूह (ष्ठ) के पद पर पदोन्नत होने पर निम्नलिखित निर्धारितों, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क (ष्ठ० श्र०) ने उनके नाम के आगे दर्शाई तिथियों को अधीक्षक, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क समूह 'ष्ठ' के पद पर कार्यभार प्रहृण कर लिया है।

ज्ञ० सं० अधीक्षकों का नाम स्थान कार्यभार प्रहृण करने की तिथि

संख्या	प्रधीक्षक (निवारक)	प्रधीक्षक (निवारक)	प्रधीक्षक (निवारक)	प्रधीक्षक (निवारक)
(1) ई० बाय० खानपुरकर	प्रधीक्षक (निवारक)	28-1-82	प्रधीक्षक (निवारक)	प्रधीक्षक (निवारक)
(2) एस० सी० निगम	प्रधीक्षक, कुम्हारी रेज	6-2-82	प्रधीक्षक, कुम्हारी रेज	(अप्रत्यक्ष)
(3) एस० एन० चतुर्वेदी	प्रधीक्षक (लेखा परीक्षा)	17-2-82	प्रधीक्षक (लेखा परीक्षा)	प्रधीक्षक (लेखा परीक्षा)

[का० सं० II (3) भगोप/81]
एस० क० घर, समाहृती

(Central Excise Collectorate : M.P.)

NOTIFICATION NO. 3/82

Indore, the 4th March, 1982

S.O. 1267.—Consequent upon their promotion as Superintendent Central Excise, Group 'B', the following inspectors of

Central Excise (S.G.), have assumed that charge as Superintendent of Central Excise, Group 'B' with effect from the date as shown against their names :—

Sl. No.	Name of the Officer	Place of Posting	Date of assumption of charge
(1)	D.Y. Khana-purkar	Superintendent (Prev) Divisional Office, Indore.	28-1-82 (F.N.)
(2)	S.C. Nigam	Superintendent, Kumhari Range	6-2-82 (A.N.)
(3)	S.N. Chaturvedi	Superintendent (Audit) Hqrs., Office, Indore	17-2-82 (F.N.)

[C.No. II(3)-Con/81/1344]
S. K. DHAR, Collector

कांडिकुम्हारीलय

आवेदन

नई विस्ती, 27 मार्च, 1982

S.O. 1268.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि नियंत्रित (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह आवश्यक और समीचीन है कि भारत सरकार के विवेद व्यापार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का०धा० 3395 तारीख 14 अक्टूबर, 1970 का भारत के नियंत्रित व्यापार के विकास के लिए नीचे विनिर्दिष्ट रिति में और संशोधन किया जाए ;

प्रीत केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रयोगत के लिए नीचे विनिर्दिष्ट प्रस्ताव भेजा है, और उसे नियंत्रित (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उप-नियम (2) की अवेक्षानुसार नियंत्रित निरीक्षण परिषद् को भेज दिया है ;

अस्त: भ्रव केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उप-नियम के प्रनुसरण में उक्त प्रस्ताव को उन सभी अक्षयों की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित कर रही है, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना है।

2. सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रस्तावों के बारे में यदि कोई व्यक्ति कोई आक्षयों सुझाव भेजना चाहे तो वह उसे इस भ्रिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से पैलालीस दिन के भीतर नियंत्रित निरीक्षण परिषद्, 3, सरस्कती मार्ग, म्युनिसिपल मार्केट विलिंग, करोल बाग, नवी विली-110005 को भेज सकता है।

प्रताप

केन्द्रीय सरकार नियंत्रित (स्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, नियंत्रित निरीक्षण परिषद् से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् भारत सरकार के विवेद व्यापार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० धा० 3395, तारीख 1 अक्टूबर, 1970 का निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त भ्रिसूचना के पैरा 3 के उप-पैरा (iv). के स्थान पर विस्तृत रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"(iv) "कालीन प्रस्तावन कपड़ा" अर्थात् पट्टसन फैब्रिक 29" (73.7 सें. मी०) से 103.9" (263.9 सें. मी०) तक संशोधन औड़ारी बाला और 104" (264.2 सें. मी०) उससे भ्रिसूचन औड़ारी बाली विभिन्न प्रकार की औड़ी रेज सहित 5 और प्रति वर्ग गज (169.5 ग्राम/प्रति वर्ग मीटर की विस्तृति

संख्याओं और बूनाईयों की कालीन की तह के विनिमाण में प्रारंभिक या भाष्यमिक घस्तरण के रूप में प्रयुक्त किया जाता है।"

[सं 6(10)/81-नि०नि० तथा नि०ज०]
सी० शी० कुकरेती, संयुक्त निवेशक

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th March, 1982

S.O. 1268.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), it is necessary or expedient to further amend the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Foreign Trade No. S.O. 3395, dated the 14th October, 1970 in the manner specified below, for the development of the export trade of India;

And whereas the Central Government has formulated the proposal specified below for the said purpose and had forwarded the same to the Export Inspection Council as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the said sub-rule, the Central Government hereby publishes the said proposal for the information of the public likely to be affected thereby,

2. Notice is hereby given that any person desiring to forward any objection or suggestion with respect to the said proposals may forward the same within forty-five days of the date of the publication of this notification to the Export Inspection Council, 3 Saraswati Marg, Municipal Market Building, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.

PROPOSAL

In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government after consulting the Export Inspection Council, makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Foreign Trade No. S.O. 3395, dated the 14th October, 1970, namely :—

For sub-paragraph (iv) of paragraph 3 of the said notification the following sub-paragraph shall be substituted namely:—

"(iv) 'Carpet Backing Cloth' that is, Jute Fabric used as primary or secondary backing in the manufacture of floor coverings of different constructions and weaves weighing from 5 oz. per square yard (169.5 gms./sq. meter) with the width range varying from 29 inches (73.7 cm.) to 103.9 inches (263.9 cm.) for narrow, and 104 inches (264.2 cm.) and above for wide, Carpet Backing."

[No. 6(10)/81-EI&EP]
C. B. KUKRETI, Lt. Director

(मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-नियंत्रण का कार्यालय)

आदेश

मई दिनलिंगी, 11 मार्च, 1982

का०मा० 1269.—सर्वश्री मिस्यूरिटी प्रिंटिंग प्रेस प्रोजेक्ट, हैदराबाद को भारत स्वीकृति, विकास आयोग महोरोग समझौता-1981 (आयात अनुभाग) के अधीन पश्चिमी जम्बनी से विभिन्न प्रिंटिंग मणीनों के लिए बड़े गोलों से छोटे गोलों में बदलने के लिए सिलिटर/रिकाइन्डर का आयात करने के लिए 10,75,500/- रुपए (केवल दस लाख पचाहतर हजार पाँच सौ रुपए) का आयात लाइसेंस संख्या आई०सी०जी०/2039-637/आर०एस० ३५३०/८१/एस०/८१/सी० जी०/एस०, दिनांक 17-10-81 प्रदान किया गया था। लाइसेंसधारी ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस को अनुलिपि भूषा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर

प्रावेदन किया है कि मूल भूषा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति लो गई है। इस आशय के सम्बन्ध में लाइसेंसधारी ने विधिवत शपथ लेने के बाद एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। लद्दनगार, मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि लाइसेंसधारक (फर्म) द्वारा लाइसेंस सं. जी०सी०जी०/2039637, दिनांक 17-10-81 को मूल विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति लो गई अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

2. यथा संशोधित आयत (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 की उप-धारा, (सी० सी०) के अधीन प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर सर्वश्री मिस्यूरिटी प्रिंटिंग प्रेस प्रोजेक्ट, हैदराबाद को जारी की गई मूल भूषा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति सं. जी०सी०जी०/2039637, दिनांक 17-10-81 एतद्वारा पक्ष की जाती है।

3. लाइसेंसधारक को उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि मूल भूषा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रयोजन प्रति प्रलग से जारी की जाती है।

[मिसिल मष्ठा सी० जी०-२/वित्त (५)/८१-८२]

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th March, 1982

S.O. 1269.—M/s. Security Printing Press Project, Hyderabad were granted import licence No. I/CG/2039637/R/SW/81/CGII/L.S. dated 17-10-81 for Rs. 10.75,500 9DM.289834.71 (Rupees Ten lakhs, seventy five thousand and five hundred only), for import of Slitter/Rewinder for slitting big reels into small reels for various printing machines from West Germany under Indo-Swedish Development Co-operation Agreement-1981 (General Imports Segment). The licensee have applied for issue of duplicate Custom purpose copy of the abovementioned Import Licence on the ground that the original Customs purpose copy has been lost. In support of their contention the licensee has filed an affidavit duly sworn in his regard. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Custom copy of licence No. C/CG/203967 dated 17-10-81 has been lost or misplaced by the party.

2. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import Control Order, 1955 as amended the said original Customs purposes copy of import licence G/CG/2039637 dated 17-10-1981 issued to the Security Printing Project, Hyderabad, is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs purposes of above said import licence is being issued to the licensee separately.

[No. CG-II/Finance(5)/81-82/1400]

नई दिल्ली, 15 मार्च, 1982

का०मा० 1270.—सर्वश्री वैस्ट बंगाल फिल्मोस्टस एप्ल लैम्पस लि०, 8, कलाइल रोड, कलकत्ता-700001 को आई०सी०आई० विश्व बक अण सं. 1511 आई०एन०मूल विदेशी मूल तथा आई०एफ०सी०आई० अरूण के अधीन लाइसेंस के लिए संलग्न सूची के अनुभाग पूँजीगत माल के आयात के लिए आयात लाइसेंस सं. आई०/जी०सी०, 2030407 एस आई०ट्री 74 एच 79-जी०जी०-2 एलएस, दिनांक 27-3-80 आई०/मी०जी०/2030411/सी०/एस्साक्स/74/एच/79/जी०जी०-2/एलएस, के स्विंक 28-3-80 और आई०सी०/2030412/एस/आर्सिएफ/74/एच/79/सी०जी०-2/एलएस, दिनांक 28-3-80 कमश जिसका मूल्य 1,79,27,337/- रुपये, 20,18,446/- रुपये और 71,31,102/- रुपये है प्रदान किए गए थे। फर्म ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंसों की अनुलिपि सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियोगी जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि इन लाइसेंसों की मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियोगी लो गई है अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गई है उन्होंने आगे बताया है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंसों की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियोगी सीमा-

शुल्क प्राधिकारी कलकता के पास संचालित की गई थी और आयात लाइसेंस सं० माई/सीजी/2030411/सी/एस्सएस/74/एच/79/सीजी-2/ एस-एस, दिनांक 28-3-1980 और सं० माई/सीजी/2030412/एस/माई०एफ/74/एच/79/सीजी-2/एस/एस, दिनांक 28-3-80 की सीमा शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियोग के मूल्य का बिल्कुल उपयोग नहीं किया गया है। लेकिन आयात लाइसेंस सं० माई/सीजी/2030407/एस/माई०/74/एच/79/सीजी-2/एस/एस दिनांक 27-3-80 की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति का 58,98,521 रुपये मूल्य के उपयोग कर लिया गया है।

3. इस तर्क के समर्थन में लाइसेंसधारी सभी लाइसेंसों के लिए नोटरी परिवर्तक कलकता के सम्मुख विधिवत् राय प्रते हुए पक्ष व्यक्त किया है। तबनुसार मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि फर्म द्वारा उपर्युक्त लाइसेंसों की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियोग जो गई प्रथमवा प्रस्तावनस्य हो गई है। यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश 1955 दिनांक 7-7-1955 की उप-धारा (सीसी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त प्रधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए सर्वशी ऐस्ट बंगाल फिल्मेंट्स एण्ड लैम्पस लिं० कलकता को जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस संख्या माई/सीजी/2030407, दिनांक 27-3-80 माई/सीजी 2030411/माई०/ सीजी/2030412 दोनों का दिनांक 23-3-80 है की भूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियोग एवं द्वारा एवं की जाती है।

3. पार्टी को उपर्युक्त लाइसेंसों की अनुसिपि सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रतियोग स्थलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[मि० सं० सीजी-2/माई०/17] 79-80/1418]
वी० के० मेहता, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक
आयात-नियंत्रण

(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

ORDER

New Delhi, 15th March, 1982

S.O. 1270.—M/s. West Bengal Filaments and Lamps Ltd., 8 Clive Road, Calcutta-700001 were granted import licences Nos. I|CG|2030407|S|IB|74|H|79|CG. II|LS dt. 27-3-80, I|CG|2030411|C|XX|74|H|79|CG. II|LS dt. 28-3-80, and I|CG|2030412|S|IF|74|H|79|CG. II|LS dt. 28-3-80 for Rs. 1,79,27,337, Rs. 20,18,446, Rs. 71,31,102 respectively for import of capital goods as per list attached under IDBI World Bank Loan No. 1511-IN, free foreign exchange and IFCI Loan. The firm has applied for issue of Duplicate copy of Customs Purposes Copies of the above mentioned licences on the ground that the original Customs Purposes copies of the licences have been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the Customs Purposes copies of the licences were registered with the Customs authority, Calcutta, and as such the value of the Customs Purposes copies of Import Licence I|CG|2030411|C|XX|74|H|79|CG. II|LS dt. 28-3-80 and No. I|CG|2030412|S|IF|74|H|79|CG. II|S dt. 28-3-80 have not been utilised at all. However, the Custom Purpose copy of Import Licence No. I|CG|2030407|S|IB|74|H|79|CG. II|LS dt. 27-3-80 has been utilised for Rs. 58,98,521.

2. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit on stamped paper for all the licences duly sworn in before a Notary Public, Calcutta. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Custom Purposes Copies of the above import licences have been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order 1955 dt. 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Custom purposes copies of Import Licence No. I|CG|2030407 dt. 27-3-80, I|CG|2030411, I|CG|2030412 both dt. 28-3-80 issued to M/s. West Bengal Filaments and Lamps Ltd., Calcutta are hereby cancelled.

3. The duplicate Customs Purposes copies of the said licences are being issued to the party separately.

[No. CG. II|ID(17)|79-80|1418]

V. K. MEHTA, Dy. Chief Controller of
Imports & Exports,

पेट्रोलियम, रसायन और उर्वरक संशालन

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई विल्ही, 6 मार्च, 1982

का० ना० 1271.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एस० पी० झी० से एन० के० झी० जी० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईयलाईन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिल्ड जानी चाहिए।

धौर यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्यावद् मनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अंजित करना आवश्यक है।

धौर यतः पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाईन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अंजन) प्रधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त व्यक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अंजित करने का प्रभाव प्राप्त किया है।

धौरते कि उक्ते भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के सीधे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्रधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, नियंत्रण और देवभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-९ को इस प्रधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

धौर ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति जिनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कायद करेगा कि क्या वह यह आहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

मनुसूची

कूप नं० एस० पी० झी० से एन० के० झी० जी० तक पाईप लाई

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—महमदाबाद	तालुका—विरमगाम
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टर एकारी सेक्टीक्टर
भटारीया	17	0 12 24

[सं० 12016/67/81-प्र० 1]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS & FERTILIZER

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 6th March, 1982

S.O. 1271.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D.S. No. SPD to NKDCC in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, O/I & Natural Gas Commission Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from D.S. No. SPD to NKDG.

State : Gujarat	District : Ahmedabad	Taluka : Virengam
Village	Survey No.	Hectare Are Centiare
Bhataria	17	0 12 24

[No. 12016/67/81-Prod. I]

का० आ० 1272—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एन० के० सी० बी० से एन० के० सी० एन० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का वर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है :

वर्णते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की माफत ।

अनुसूची

एन० के० सी० बी० से एन० के० सी० एन० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिये

राज्य : गुजरात	जिना और तालुका—मेहसाणा	
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर एकार्ड सेटीशन
मकरपुरा	293	0 . 03 80

[सं० 12016/67/81-प्र० II]

S.O. 1272.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from NKCV to NKCN in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from D.S. No. NKCV to NKCN

State : Gujarat District & Taluka : Mehsana

Village	Survey No.	Hectare Are	Cen-tiare
Dhanpura	293	0 03 60	

[No. 12016/67/81-Prod.-II]

का० आ० 1273—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एन० के० सी० बी० से एन० के० सी० एस० से एन० के० सी० एफ० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन

1436 GI/81—3

के लिये पाईपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिए।

यत्र यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का वर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है :

वर्णते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की माफत ।

अनुसूची

एन० के० सी० बी० से एन० के० सी० एन० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : अहमदाबाद	सालुका—विरमगम
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर एकार्ड सेटीशन
तेलावी	27	0 03 00
	18	0 19 52
	17/2	0 08 04

[सं० 12016/73/81-प्र० I]

S.O. 1273.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from NKCT to NKCL to NKCF in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from NKCT to NKCL to NKCF

State : Gujarat Distrct : Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Hectare Are	Cen-tiare
Telavi	27	0 03 00	
	18	0 19 52	
	17/2	0 08 04	

[No. 12016/73/81-Prod. I]

का० आ० 1274—यस केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एम० इ० ओ० से सोभासण जी० जी० एस०-II तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह: यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिलाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतत्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है :

बास्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिलाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्तम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरसुरा रोड, बडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत ही या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० एस० इ० ओ० से सोभासण जी० जी० एस०-II तक पाइप लाइन बिलाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात		जिला और तालुक : मेहसाना		
गाँव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टर	ए आर० ई सेटीभार	
जगुदान	644	0	07	90
	645	0	12	95
	640	0	04	68
	640	0	07	20
	633	0	01	80
	639	0	15	48
	464	0	03	60

[सं० 12016/73/81-प्र० II]

S.O. 1275.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from SFO to SOB GUS II in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline; it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by subsection (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from D.S. No. SEO to SOB. CGS-II

State : Gujarat District & Taluka : Mehsana

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Arc	Centiare
Jagudan	644	0	07	90
	645	0	12	95
	640	0	04	68
	640	0	07	20
	633	0	01	80
	639	0	15	48
	464	0	03	60

[No. 12016/73/81-Prod. II]

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1982

का० आ० 1275—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एन० के० सी० थी० से एन० के० सी० एन० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह: यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिलाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतत्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (II) द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आयोग एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बास्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिलाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्तम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरसुरा रोड, बडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत ही या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० एन० के० सी० थी० से एन० के० सी० एन० तक पाइप लाइन बिलाने लिए

राज्य—गुजरात	जिला—ग्रहमकाबाद तालुका—विरमगाम		
गाँव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टर	ए आर० ई सेटीभार
तेलवाडी	34	0	24 60
	35	0	03 60
	36	0	11 40
	37/1	0	12 00
	67	0	13 56

[सं० 12016/70/81-प्र० I]

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1981

S.O. 1275.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from DS No NKCV to NKCN in Gujarat pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission:

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be hear in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from DS. No. NKCV to NKCN

State : Gujarat District : Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Hectare Are	Centi-are
Telavi	34	0 24	60
	55	0 03	60
	36	0 11	40
	37/1	0 12	00
	67	0 13	56

[No. 12016/70/81-Prod. I]

का० आ० 1276.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सोकलित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में ऐन० के० डब्ल्य० से जी० जी० एस० एन० के०-१ तक गुजरात पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एटदपाबद्ध अनुसूची में अंगित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित आवश्यक है।

प्रतः ग्रन्थ पेट्रोलियम और अनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवक्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वार्षे कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और बेकामाल प्रभाग, मफरपुरा रोड, बडोदरा-९ को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिविष्ट है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० एन० के० डब्ल्य० से० जी० जी० एस० एन० के० I तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला	महमदाबाद	तालुका : विरमगम
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टर	एकार्ड सेन्टीआर्ड
सेजवी	209/9	0 15	60
	209/11	0 00	72

[सं० 12016/70/81-प्र० II]

S.O. 1276.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D.S. No. NKW to NGS NK I in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be hear in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE Pipelines from D.S. No. NKM to GGS NK. I

State : Gujarat District : Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Hectare Are	Centi-are
Telavi	209/9	0 15	60
	209/11	0 00	72

[No. 12016/70/81-Prod. II]

का० आ० 1277 :—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सोकलित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में सी० जी० सी० से 18 ए तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप लाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एटदपाबद्ध अनुसूची में अंगित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

प्रतः ग्रन्थ पेट्रोलियम और अनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवक्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है :

वार्षे कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और बेकामाल प्रभाग, करमपुरा रोड, बडोदरा-९ को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिन के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिविष्ट है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० जी० जी० सी० से 18 ए तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला	खेडा	तालुका : खंडाल
गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टर	एकार्ड सेन्टीआर्ड
नेजा	58	0 01	30
	43	0 10	14
	42	0 07	80
	41	0 00	60
काटे द्रेक	0	0 00	78
	71	0 02	86

[सं० 12016/65/81-प्र० II]

S.O. 1277.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from CBC to D.S. 18-A in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction and Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009.)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be hear in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from Well No. CBC to D.S. 18-A

State : Gujarat District : Kaira Taluka : Cambay

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare
Neja	58	0	01	30
	43	0	10	14
	42	0	07	80
	41	0	00	60
	Cart track	0	00	78
	71	0	02	86

[No. 12016/65/81-Prod.]

का०आ० 1278 :—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है, कि गुजरात राज्य में एन० के० ३८४० से जी०३१० एन० एन० के० १ तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप-साइन सेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिलाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अंजित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अंजन) प्रधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अंजित करने का अपना प्राप्ताय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

ब्राह्मों कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिलाने के लिए आक्षेप सकार अंगिकारी सेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देवभाल प्रभाग, कमरपुरा रोड, बडोपारा-१ को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भोतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिविष्टः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कृप नं० एन० के० ३८४० से जी०३१० एम० प्य० के० १ तक पाइप साइन बिलाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	जिला : अहमदाबाद	तालुका : विरमगाम		
गाँव	सर्वों नं०	हैक्टेयर	एकाई	सेंटीयर
भटारीया	87	0	17	88
कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	72	
64/9	0	06	24	

64/1	0	06	00
64/5	0	03	60
65/2	0	07	92
65/3	0	03	60
65/1	0	03	60
Cart track	0	00	72
71/4	0	05	52
71/1	0	04	80
72/2	0	06	84
72/1	0	06	60

[सं० 12016/68/81-प्र०-१]

S.O. 1278.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from NKW to GOS NK-1 in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009.)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be hear in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from D.S. No. NKW to GGS NK-1

State : Gujarat District: Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare
Bhataria	87	0	17	88
Cart track	0	00	72	
64/9	0	06	24	
64/1	0	06	00	
64/5	0	03	60	
65/2	0	07	92	
65/3	0	03	60	
65/1	0	03	60	
Cart track	0	00	60	
71/4	0	05	52	
71/1	0	04	80	
72/2	0	06	84	
72/1	0	06	60	

[No. 12016/68/81-Prod.-I]

का०आ० 1279 :—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एन० के० सी० एम० से एन० के० ०३१० जे० १० तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइप-साइन सेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिलाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्वाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अंजित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अंजन) प्रधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार

ने उमरें उत्तरोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का प्रयत्न आशंका एवं द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बास्तें कि उक्त भूमि में हितबढ़ क्षोई व्यक्ति, उम भूमि के नीचे पाई लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और वेखभाल प्रशासन, मकानपुरग रोड, बटोडग-१ को इस प्रधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर मकेगा।

ओर ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिविष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह बाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विभिन्न व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

मानसूची

एन० के० सी० एम० से एन० के० बी० जे० तक पाश्प लाइन बिछाने के लिए।

राज्य : गुजरात	गिला : महमदाबाद	तालूका : विरमगाम		
गाँव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टेयर	एक्टरहौ	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
तेलावी	72	0	08	76
	71/1	0	00	60
	71/3	0	08	76
	71/4	0	06	12
	65/2	0	06	12
	65/1	0	00	84
	65/5	0	06	12
	66	0	16	36
	38/1	0	01	80
	38/2	0	06	24

[सं० 12016/68/81—प्र०-II]
टी० एन० परमेश्वरन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 1279.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from NKCM to NKBJ in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from D.S. No. NK CM to NKBJ

State : Gujarat District : Ahmedabad Taluka : Viramgam

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Acre	Centiare
Telavi	72	0	08	76
	71/1	0	00	60
	71/3	0	08	76
	71/4	0	06	12
	65/2	0	06	12
	65/1	0	00	84
	65/5	0	06	12
	66	0	16	36
	38/1	0	01	80
	38/2	0	06	24

[No. 12016/68/81-Prod.-II]

T. N. PARAMESWARAN, Under Secy.

(राजपत्र और उर्वरक विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 मार्च, 1982

सं० आ० 1280.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिकारीयों की बेदखली) अधिनियम 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत सरकार के पेटोलियम रमायन और उर्वरक समालय, रमायन और उर्वरक विभाग की प्रधि-सूचना सं० का धा० 3257 तारीख 28-11-1981 का निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, प्रधार्यत्

उक्त अधिसूचना में सारणी के स्तम्भ (1) के नीचे की विशेषांक प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात् —

“भारत साधक अधिकारी

उप नगर प्रशासन

प्र० इन्डियन प्र० एवं फार्मसीट्यूटिकल
सिमिटेक, मद्रास ।

[सं० एन०-38022/17/78/सी० ना०]

वी० राजगोपालन, अवर सचिव

(Department of Chemicals and Fertilizers)

New Delhi, the 15th March, 1982

S.O. 1280.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Petroleum, Chemicals and Fertilizers, Department of Chemicals and Fertilizers No. S.O. 3257 dated the 28-11-81, namely :—

In the said Notification for the existing entry under column (1) of the Table, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Officer-in-charge, Township
Administration, India Drugs
and Pharmaceuticals Limited, Madras.”

[No. L-38022/17/78-DV]

V. RAJAGOPALAN, Under Secy.

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण संशालन

नई दिल्ली, 16 मार्च, 1982

सं० आ० 1281.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद नियमाबले 1957 के खण्ड (घ) का अनुसरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद अधिनियम 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 3 को उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) के, अन्तर्गत केरल राज्य से भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद के सदस्य का नवाचित करने के लिए एतद्वाया शो पी के० परमेश्वरन नवदय, रजिस्ट्रर आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद, केरल राज्य को निर्वाचित अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० वी० 11013/1/82-एम० ई० (नीति)]

प्रकाश चन्द्र जैन, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 16th March, 1982

S.O. 1281.—In pursuance of clause (d) of rule 2 of the Indian Medical Council Rules, 1957, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. K. Parameswaran Nair, Registrar of Medical Councils, Kerala State, as Returning Officer for the conduct of election of a member of the Medical Council of

India under clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), from the State of Kerala.

[No. V. 11013|1|82-M.E. (Policy)]
P. C. JAIN, Under Secy.

ग्रामीण पुनर्निर्माण भवालय

नई बिल्ली, 15 मार्च, 1982

का० आ० 1282.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, माधारण श्रेणीकरण और विकास नियम 1937 के नियम 4 के खंड (स) और (ट) के साथ पालि और कृषि उपज (श्रेणीकरण और विकासन) अधिनियम, 1937 (1937 का 1) की धारा 3 के खंड (च) द्वारा प्रदत्त गतियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतूर्व कृषि और भिजाई मंत्रालय (प्रामीण विभाग) की अधिसूचना संंख्या का० आ० 1200, तारीख 31 मार्च, 1977 को अधिकान करने हुए, गतियों में हप प्रधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की। तारीख से एकमाह के अधीन श्रेणीकृत कच्चा मांस (शीतित

या हिमायित) के लिए प्रभार प्रति किलोग्राम या उसके भाग पर 10 पैसे की दर से नियम करते हैं।

[मं० 13-9/75-7० एम०]

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

New Delhi, the 15th March, 1982

S.O. 1282.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause(f) of section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937) and read with clauses (i) and (k) of rule 4 of the General Grading and Marking Rules, 1937, and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the erstwhile Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Department of Rural Development), No. S.O. 1200 dated the 31st March, 1977, the Central Government hereby fixes, with effect from the date of publication on his notification in the Official Gazette the label charges for raw meat (chilled or frozen), graded under Agmark, at the rate of 10 paise per kg. or part thereof.

[No. 13-9/75-AM]

का० आ० 1283.—बनस्पति तेल श्रेणीकरण और विकासन नियम, 1955 का और विकासन अधिनियम, 1937 (1937 का 1) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित भारत सरकार के ग्रामीण पुनर्निर्माण मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 3420 तारीख 24 नवम्बर, 1980 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) तारीख 13 नवम्बर, 1980, पृष्ठ —— पर प्रकाशित किया गया था, जिसमें उक्त अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से पैतालीस दिन की अवधि की भवानि के पूर्व उन सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्रमण और सुमाव भागे गए थे, जिनके उससे प्रभावित होने की संभावना है।

और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतियाँ 26 नवम्बर, 1980 को जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गईथीं;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत प्राप्त आक्रमणों और सुमावों पर विचार कर लिया है;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त गतियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बनस्पति तेल श्रेणीकरण और विकासन नियम, 1955 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

नियम

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ:—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बनस्पति तेल श्रेणीकरण और विकासन (संशोधन) नियम, 1982 है।

2. बनस्पति तेल श्रेणीकरण और विकासन नियम, 1955 में:—

(i) अनुसूची 1 में:—

(क) मद “श्रेणी-1 (कम सारवाला खाने योग्य)” और उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों को हटाया जाएगा;

(ख) मद श्रेणी 2 (खाने योग्य) में, स्तम्भ 9 में, विद्यमान प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर “0.10 से 0.60”, प्रविष्टि रखो जाएगी;

(ii) अनुसूची 2 में:—

(क) मद “ब्रौषधीय” में, स्तम्भ 4, 11 और 13 में, विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टियाँ रखो जाएंगी, प्रति:—

“3.5 (1 इंच सेव में), “2.0”, और “0.25”;

(ख) स्तम्भ 14 और उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों को हटाया जाएगा;

(ग) स्तम्भ 13 के पश्चात्, निम्नलिखित नए स्तम्भ अन्वय स्थापित किए जाएंगे, प्रति:—

1 डै०मी० मोटाई में 19.5 सें० 20.5 सें० पर (उससे कम नहीं)

विलेपता

पहचान

थूंपंत (आर्टिकल रोटेशन)।

14

15

16

(घ) मद “ब्रौषधीय” और उससे सम्बन्धित प्रविष्टियों के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित मद और प्रविष्टियाँ अन्वय स्थापित की जाएंगी, प्रति:—

विवरण	सेल ऐरण्ड के बीचों (स्लिसन-कफ्मनिस) से निकाला गया विशुद्ध प्रतश परिष्कृत उत्पाद होगा। यह प्रत्य तेल या पदार्थ के मिश्रण से मुक्त होगा और तल छड़ तथा बुले हुए पदार्थ से मुक्त होगा।	1	2	3	4	5	6		
		7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
177 से 187	82 से 90	143.0	—	2.0	—	—	—	—	3.5
*	15					16			

प्रत्यक्षोहल (95 प्रतिशत) के 2.5 भाग में विलेपता; निर्जलित अन्वय कोहल और ग्लैसिप्स ऐसेटिक अस्त के साथ मिश्रणीय होगा।

लाईट ऐटोलियम के आवश्यक (बाल्यूम) के साथ मिश्रणों (उत्पादन की सीमा 40 सें० से 60 सें०) तथा केवल दो आवश्यक (बाल्यूम) में अंगिह विलेपता।

[फा०स० 13-2/76-८०एम०]

दौ० मेहता, विवेषक

S.O. 1283.—Whereas certain draft rules further to amend the Vegetable Oils Grading and Marking Rules 1955, were published as required by section 3 of the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking) Act, 1937 (1 of 1937) at page 4299 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii), dated 13th December, 1980, with the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Rural Reconstruction, No. S.O. 3420 dated 24th November, 1980, inviting objections and suggestions from all persons likely to be affected thereby before the expiry of a period of forty five days from the date on which copies of the Official Gazette containing the said notification are made available to the public;

And whereas copies of the said gazette were made available to the public on the 26th December, 1980;

And whereas objections and suggestions received in respect of the said draft rules from the public were considered by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Vegetable Oils Grading and Marking Rules, 1955, namely :—

RULES

1. These Rules may be called the Vegetable Oils Grading and Marking (Amendment) Rules, 1982.

2. In the Vegetable Oils Grading and Marking Rules, 1955,—

(i) in Schedule IV,—

(A) item "Grade-I (Low Pungency Edible)" and entries relating thereto shall be deleted;

(B) in item Grade 2 (Edible) in column 9, for the existing entry, the entry "0.10 to 0.60", shall be substituted;

(ii) in Schedule IX,—

(A) in item "Medicinal", in columns 4, 11, and 13 for the existing entries the following shall, respectively, be substituted, namely :—
"3.5 (in 1 inch cell)", "2.0", and "0.25";

(B) column 14 and entries relating thereto shall be deleted;

(C) after column 13, the following new columns shall be inserted, namely :—

Optical rotation at 19.5 to 20.5° C on 1 dm. thickness (not less than)					Solubility		Identification	
					14	15	16	
(D) after item "Medicinal" and the entries relating thereto, the following item and entries shall be inserted, namely :—								
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Special	The oil shall be the genuine cold drawn refined produce of castor seed (<i>Ricinus Communis</i>). It shall be free from admixture with other oil or substance and also free from sediment and suspended matter.	0.954 to 0.960	1.4700 to 1.4740	177 to 187	82 to 90	143.0
10	11	12	13	14	15	16		
—	2.0	—	—	3.5	Soluble in 2.5 parts of alcohol (95%); Miscible with dehydrated alcohol, and with glacial acetic acid.	Miscible with half its volume of light petroleum (Boiling range 40° to 60° and only partially soluble in two volumes.		

[F. No. 13-2/76-AM]
D. MEHTA, Director

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

(सम्पदा निवेशालय)

नई दिल्ली, 22 मार्च, 1982

S.O. 1284.—मारत सरकार, निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय सं. का. आ. 3307 तारीख 7 नवम्बर, 1981 की अधिसूचना जो तारीख 5 दिसम्बर, 1981 के भाग का राजपत्र भाग-II खंड-3, उपवट्ट (ii) में पृष्ठ 3784 पर प्रकाशित हुई थी, के अधिकारण और सरकारी निवास-स्थान शब्दांत (इन्डौर में माध्यरेण, पूल) नियम, 1979 के अनुपरक नियम 317-ए-३ के खंड (अ) के अनुसरण में, राष्ट्रपति एवं द्वारा प्रत्रिल, 1982 के प्रथम दिन में प्रारम्भ होने वाले और मार्च, 1984 के 31वें दिन को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को आवास वर्ष की अवधि के रूप में अधिसूचित करते हैं।

[मिल सं.डी-11031/44/81-रीजन्स-II(i)]

MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING

(Directorate of Estate)

New Delhi, the 22nd March, 1982

S.O. 1284.—In supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Works and Housing No. S.O. 3307 dated the 7th November, 1981 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3—Sub-section (ii) dated 5th December, 1981 at page 3784 and in pursuance of clause (b) of S.R. 317-AS-2 of the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Indore) Rules, 1979, the President hereby notifies the period commencing on the 1st day of April, 1982 and ending on the 31st day of March, 1984 as the period of the allotment year.

[File No. D-11031/44/81-Regions(i)]

का० गा० 1285.—भारत सरकार, नियमि और भावास मंत्रालय सं० का० गा० 3308 तारीख 7 नवम्बर, 1981 की प्रधिसूचना जो तारीख 5 दिसम्बर, 1981 के भारत का राजपत्र-II, खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) में पृष्ठ 3784 पर प्रकाशित हुई थी, के प्रधिकरण और सरकारी निवास-स्थान आवंटन (गाजियाबाद में साधार IV तूल), नियम, 1979 के प्रत्युष्य नियम 317-ए०ग्राह०-२ के खंड (ख) के अनुसरण में, राष्ट्रपति एवं द्वारा प्रब्रील, 1982 के प्रथम दिन से प्राप्ति होने वाली और मार्च, 1984 के 31वें दिन को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि को आवंटन वर्ष की अवधि के रूप में घोषित करते हैं।

[भिसिल सं०-बी०-11031/44/81-गीजस्ट (ii)]

राम स्वरूप सूर्य,
संपदा उप निदेशक (नीति)

S.O. 1285.—In spesecion of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Works and Housing No. S.O. 3308 dated the 7th November, 1981 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3—Sub-section (ii) dated 5th December, 1981 at page 3784 and in pursuance of clause (b) of S.R. 317-AR-2 of the Allotment of Government Residences (General Pool in Ghaziabad) Rules, 1979, the President hereby notifies the period commencing on the 1st day of April, 1982 and ending on the 31st day of March, 1984 as the period of the allotment year.

[File No. D-11031/44/81-Regions(ii)]

R. S. SOOD, Dy. Director of Estates (Policy)

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

आदेश

तई विली, 12 मार्च, 1982

का०गा० 1286.—फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड के कार्यकरण से सम्बन्धित विनियमों के नियम 14(ख) के उपवर्णों के प्रत्यर्गत प्रवत्त प्रविकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं द्वारा इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्मों को उनके सभी भारतीय भावाओं के रूपान्तरों सहित, जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है:—

क्रम सं०	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की उम्मीद मोटरों में	प्रावेदक का नाम	नियमों का नाम	यह वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिशा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या फिल्म है या डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म है।
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1722	297	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24, पेटर रोड, वर्म्है-28			समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
2. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1723 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1723 (केन्द्रीय दर्शक)।	298	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24, पेटर रोड, वर्म्है-28			समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमशः सामान्य प्रदर्शन और केन्द्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।
3. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1724 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1724 (केन्द्रीय परिचय)।	301	फिल्म प्रभाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पेटर रोड, वर्म्है-28			समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमशः सामान्य प्रदर्शन और केन्द्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।
4. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1725 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1725 (केन्द्रीय उत्तर)।	302		-तथैव-		-तथैव-
5. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1726 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1726 (केन्द्रीय पूर्व)।	296		-तथैव-		-तथैव-
6. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1727	197		-तथैव-		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
7. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1728-ए	302		-तथैव-		-तथैव-
8. भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1728	281		-तथैव-		-तथैव-
9. (क) भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1729 तथा भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1729 (केन्द्रीय दर्शक)।	293		-तथैव-		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमशः सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
(ख) भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1729 (केन्द्रीय परिचय)।					

1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	(क) भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1730 तथा भारतीय समाचार संख्या 1730 (क्षेत्रीय उत्तर)।	306	फिल्म प्रश्नाग, भारत सरकार, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म क्रमांक सामान्य और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
	(ख) भारतीय समीक्षा संख्या 1730 और भारतीय समीक्षा संख्या 1730 (क्षेत्रीय पूर्वी)।	281	-तर्थैव-	-तर्थैव-	
11.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1730-ए	304.00	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
12.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1731 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1731 (विज्ञान क्षेत्रीय)।	303	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं का फिल्म। क्रमांक सामान्य और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
13.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1732 और भारतीय समीक्षा संख्या 1732 (क्षेत्रीय परिचय)।	302	-तर्थैव-	-तर्थैव-	
14.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1733 और भारतीय समीक्षा संख्या 1733 (क्षेत्रीय उत्तर)।	302	-तर्थैव-	-तर्थैव-	
15.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1734-ए	303	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
16.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1734 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1734 (क्षेत्रीय पूर्व)।	275	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमांक सामान्य और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
17.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1735 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1735 (क्षेत्रीय दक्षिण)।	304	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमांक सामान्य प्रदर्शन और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
18.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1736 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1736 (क्षेत्रीय परिचय)।	251	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमांक सामान्य प्रदर्शन और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
19.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1737 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षक संख्या 1737 (क्षेत्रीय उत्तर)।	302	-तर्थैव-	-तर्थैव-	
20.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1738	299	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
21.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1739 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1739 (क्षेत्रीय पूर्व)।	301	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमांक सामान्य और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
22.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1740 और भारतीय समीक्षा संख्या 1740 (क्षेत्रीय दक्षिण)।	3044	-तर्थैव-	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। क्रमांक सामान्य और क्षेत्रीय प्रदर्शन के लिए।	
23.	भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1741 और भारतीय समाचार समीक्षा संख्या 1741 (क्षेत्रीय परिचय)।	229	-तर्थैव-	-तर्थैव-	

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

ORDER

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1982

S.O. 1286.—In exercise of the powers vested under the provisions of Rule 1.4(b) of the Regulations relating to the Working of the Film Advisory Board, the Central Government hereby approves films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their languages version to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said schedule.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length of the film in metres	Name of the applicant	Name of the Producer	Brief synopsis whether a scientific film or for educational purposes or film dealing with news current documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. INR No. 1722	.	297 mtrs	Films Division, Govt. of India, Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	24-	News & Current Events, General release.
2. INR No. 1723 & INR No. 1723 (Regional South)		298 mtrs	-do-		News and Current Event General and Regional release respecti- vely.
3. INR No. 1724 and INR No. 1724 (Regional West)		301 mtrs	-do-		-do-
4. INR No. 1725 & INR No. 1725 (Regional North)		302 mtrs	-do-		-do-
5. INR No. 1726 & INR No. 1726 (Regional East)		296 mtrs	-do-		-do-
6. INR No. 1727	.	297 mtrs	-do-		New, and Current Events, General release.
7. INR No. 1728-A	.	302 mtrs	-do-		-do-
8. INR No. 1728	.	281 mtrs	-do-		-do-
9. (a) INR No. 1729 & INR No. 1729 (Regional South)		293 mtrs	-do-		News and Current Events, Gen- eral and regional release res- pectively.
(b) INR No. 1729 & INR No. 1729 (Regional West)		270 mtrs	-do-		-do-
10. (a) INR No. 1730 & INR No. 1730 (Regional North)		300 mtrs	-do-		-do-
(b) INR No. 1730 & INR No. 1730 (Regional East)		281 mtrs	-do-		-do-
11. INR No. 1730-A	.	304 00	-do-		News and Current events, Generl release.
12. INR No. 1731 and INR No. 1731 (Regional South)		303 mtrs	-do-		News and current events, General and regional release respecti- vely
13. INR No. 1732 & INR No. 1732 (Regional West)		302 mtrs	-do-		-do-
14. INR No. 1733 and INR No. 1733 (Regional North)		302 mtrs	-do-		-do-
15. INR No. 1734-A	.	303 mtrs	-do-		News and Current events, Generl release.
16. INR No. 1734 & INR No. 1734 (Regional East)		275 mtrs	-do-		News and Current events Generl and regional release respecti- vely
17. INR No. 1735 & INR No. 1735 (Regional South)		304 mtrs	-do-		-do-
18. INR No. 1736 & INR No. 1736 (Regional West)		251 mtrs	-do-		-do-
19. INR No. 1737 & INR No. 1737 (Regional North)		302 mtrs	-do-		-do-

1	2	3	4	5	6
20. INR No. 1738	.	299 mtrs	Films Division, Govt. of India, 24-Paddar Road, Bombay-26	News & Current events, General release.	
21. INR No. 1739 and INR No. 1739	301 mtrs (Regional East)		-do-	News & Current events, General release respectively.	
22. INR No. 1740 & INR No. 1740	301 mtrs (Regional South)		-do-	-do-	
23. INR No. 1741 & INR No. 1741	295 mtrs (Regional West)		-do-	-do-	

[F. No. 315/2/82-F(P)]

SUKUMAR MANDAL, Desk Officer

संचार मंत्रालय
(इलात तार बोर्ड)
नई दिल्ली, 11 मार्च, 1982

क्र. ० आ० 1287.—स्थायी भारतीय संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिवेशक ने घोलापालेम, पोदुर, कोडिमियाल, सिरवेल, कोलमेश्वर, प्रसात्तिनिलयम, ताडिमारि, घटल-पाल्लि। टेलीफोन केन्द्र में दिनांक 1-4-1982 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निष्पत्ति किया है।

[संख्या 5-6/82-पी.एच.बी.]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS
(P&T. Board)

New Delhi, the 11th March, 1982

S.O. 1287.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies 1-4-1982 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Gollapalem, Poduru, Kodimiyal, Sirvel, Kothachervu, Prasanthinayam, Tadimurri & Bathalapalli, Telephone Exchanges, Andhra Pradesh Circle.

[No. 5-6/82-PHB]

नई दिल्ली, 18 मार्च 1982

क्र. ० आ० 1288.—स्थायी भारतीय संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1980 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिवेशक ने नुजिवीहु टेलीफोन केन्द्र में दिनांक 1-4-1982 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निष्पत्ति किया है।

[संख्या 5-6/82-पी.एच.बी.]

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1982

S.O. 1288.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S. O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Post and Telegraphs, hereby specifies 1-4-1982 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Nuzvid Telephone Exchange, Andhra Pradesh Circle.

[No. 5-6/82-PHB]

क्र. ० आ० 1289.—स्थायी भारतीय संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिवेशक ने मिरवाला-

गुडा टेलीफोन केन्द्र में दिनांक 1-4-1982 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निष्पत्ति किया है।

[संख्या 5-6/82-पी.एच.बी.]

[No. 5-6/82-PHB]

नई दिल्ली, 19 मार्च, 1982

क्र. ० आ० 1290.—स्थायी भारतीय संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिवेशक ने कलूद, गोदावरी खानि, खानीकुड़ा, कल्दीनीकोला ; कुमुमन्दू ; चौर, काजीपट, भोरी तथा साकीनीटीपाली टेलीफोन केन्द्र में दिनांक 1-4-1982 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निष्पत्ति किया है।

[संख्या 5-6/81-पी.एच.बी.]

मार० सी० कटारिया

सहायक महानिवेशक (पी०.एक०.बी०)

New Delhi, the 19th March, 1982

S.O. 1290.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies 1-4-1982 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Kalluri, Godavari Khani, Kadikuppam, Katrenikona, Kusumanchi, Chennur Kazipet, Mori and Sakinetipalli Telephone Exchanges, Andhra Pradesh Circle.

[No. 5-6/81-PHB]

R. C. KATARIA, Assit. Director General (PHB)

अम मंत्रालय

आवेदन

नई दिल्ली, 28 दिसम्बर, 1981

क्र. ० आ० 1291.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उत्तराखण्ड अनुसूची में विशिष्ट विषय के बारे में वैक भाफ इंडिया से सम्बद्ध एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियंत्रणों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायिकरण के लिए विशेषित करता बाधकीय समझती है ;

प्रत, कन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद प्रधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 के अन्तर धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अंडे (ध) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक प्रधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पाठासीन प्रधिकारी श्री जी० एस० बरोट होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय भ्रहमदावाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त प्रधिकरण का स्थायनियन्त के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

भ्रहमदावाद

“व्या महागुजरात बैक कमंचारी संघर्ष की उपाखंड “क” में वर्णित औद्योगिक कमंचारियों को बैक आफ इडिया, धोदोय कायलिय, भ्रहमदावाद के प्रबंधतव द्वारा नियमित करते और स्थायी रूप से औद्योजित करने की मांग थी, उचित और न्यायोचित है। यदि हाँ, तो कमंकार किस तारीख से और किस अनुसार के हकदार हैं?

अनुबंध—३

क्रमांक	नाम	शास्त्रा	पद महृण करने की तारीख	महृताएँ	इस समय पढ़ रहा है	टिप्पणियाँ
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	श्री विष्णुराम के० पार्थी	भ्रहमदावाद	27-9-74	एम०बी०बी०एस०	इंटर्नेशनल कर रहा है।	
2.	कुमार॑ म्यूरिका वी० शाह	भ्रहमदावाद	10-8-75	बी०काम	एस०एल०बी०-II	
3.	श्री राजेन्द्र कुमार के० काणिक	भ्रहमदावाद	28-3-75	बी०काम०, एल०एल०बी०	कराधान व्यवसाय में डिप्लोमा	
4.	श्री म्यूरजे० शाह	भ्रहमदावाद	2-1-76	बी०काम०, एल०एल०बी०	-योक-	
5.	कुमार॑ राधिन॑ के० पारिख	भ्रहमदावाद	21-2-78	एम०ए०	एल०एल०बी०-II	
6.	श्री उपेन्द्र भाई० एस० ठक्कर	शाश्वत रोड	27-9-74	बी०काम०, एल०एल०बी०	एल०एल०बी० विशेष	
7.	श्री राजेन्द्र वी० शाराफ	सेलही चकला	7-2-78	बी०काम० (प्रथम श्रेणी)	एल०एल०बी०-II	
8.	श्री कमलेश कुमार वी० दानी	एलिस ब्रिज	1-9-78	बी०एस०सी०	एस०एस०सी०-II	
9.	श्री उपेन्द्र भाई० पाट्या	एलिस ब्रिज	1-2-73	बी०काम०	एल०एल०बी०-II	
10.	कुमार॑ नीला० एस० भट्ट	एलिस ब्रिज	12-3-75	बी०ए०	एल०एल०बी०-II	
11.	श्री गोविन्द भाई० वी० मकवाना (अनुसूचित जाति)	गांधी रोड	1-3-79	एस०एस०सी०	एस०वाई०बी०काम०	
12.	श्री अशोक सोमलाल पन्थल	गांधी रोड	13-5-72	बी०काम०, एल०एल०बी० (विशेष)	कराधान व्यवसाय में डिप्लोमा	
13.	श्री कमुमाई ग्राह० नहारिया (अनुसूचित जाति)	गांधी रोड	9-10-78	बी०काम०	एस०काम०-I	
14.	कुमार॑ चिरिंग एस० भोजा	मण्डी पोल	1-3-79	बी०ए०	एल०एल०बी०-II	
15.	श्री शेनेस वी० पटेल	मावरंगपुरा	1-5-76	एस०एस०सी०	एस०वाई०बी० काम०	
16.	श्री मर्ति कल्पना एन० पटेल	मवरंगपुरा	27-9-74	बी०ए०	एल०एल०बी०-II	
17.	कुमार॑ वी० ता जी० देवे	मवरंगपुरा	10-4-75	बी०ए०	एल०एल०बी० प्रथम	
18.	श्री घनिल मार० पटेल	ग्यू क्लार्थ मार्केट	23-8-73	बी०काम०	एल०एल०बी०-I	
19.	श्री घर॑ मेहा के० पटेल	चयपुर चकेला	9-12-74	बी०ए०	एल०एल०बी०-II	
20.	कुमार॑ घसका० शाह	रू ली फ रोड	24-1-79	बी०एस०सी०	एस०एस०सी०-II	
21.	श्री धरिंश एम० पटेल	रीली फ रोड	24-5-73	बी०एस०सी० प्रथम वर्ष	बी०एस०सी०, डितीय वर्ष	
22.	श्री मोहम्मद हर्न॑ फ ए० मलिक	सरसपुर	8-2-73	बी०काम०	एल०एल०बी०-II	
23.	श्री प्रकाश झार० शाह	शानपुर चकला	27-9-74	बी०ए०, एस०एल०बी०	कराधान व्यवसाय में डिप्लोमा	
24.	श्री जयत कुमार वी० भट्ट	भानक छोक	10-12-73	बी०काम०, एल०एल०बी०	-योक-	
25.	श्री हिमान्शु के० पटेल	स्टेशन	17-8-78	एस०एस०सी०	बी०काम० (डितीय वर्ष)	
26.	श्री केसवभाई० एस० परमार (अनुसूचित जाति)	स्टेशन	15-2-79	बी०काम०	एल०एल०बी०-I	
27.	श्री बांगेश ए० शान	स्टेशन	1-3-79	बी०काम०	एस०काम०-I	
28.	श्री अशोक कुमार वी० महारिया (अनुसूचित जाति)	स्टेशन	10-2-78	एस०एस०सी०	बी०काम०, प्रथम वर्ष	
29.	श्री पारेश वी० पाण्ड्या	पाल्डी	23-8-73	बी०काम०, एल०एल०बी०	एल०एल०बी०-III	

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDER

New Delhi, the 28th December, 1981

S.O. 1291.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Bank of India and their workman in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1977), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri G. S. Barot shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ahmedabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the demand of the Maha Gujarat Bank Employees Association for regularisation and permanent absorption of part-time employees mentioned in Annexure 'A' by the management of Bank of India Regional Office, Ahmedabad is legal, reasonable and justified if so, from what date and what relief the workmen are entitled ?

ANNEXURE—I

S. No.	Name	Branch	Date of joining	Qualifications	At present studying in	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Shri Vishram K. Parghi	Ahmedabad	27-9-74	M.B.B.S.	Doing Internship	
2.	Miss Mayurika B. Dave	Ahmedabad	10-8-75	B.Com.	LL.B.-II	
3.	Shri Rajendrakumar K. Karnik	Ahmedabad	28-3-75	B.Com., LL.B.	Diploma in Taxation Practice.	
4.	Shri Mayur J. Shah	Ahmedabad	2-1-76	B. Com. LL.B.	Diploma in Taxation Practice.	
5.	Miss Ragini K. Parikh	Ahmedabad	21-2-78	M.A.	LL.B.-II	
6.	Shri Upendrabhai M. Thakai	Ashram Road	27-9-74	B.Com., LL.B.	LL.B. (Special)	
7.	Shri Rajendra D. Shraff	Delhi Chakla	7-2-78	B.Com. (Ist Class	LL.B.-II	
8.	Shri Kamlesh Kumar V. Dani	Ellis Bridge	1-9-78.	B.Sc.	M.Sc.-II	
9.	Shri Upendra I. Padnya	Ellis Bridge	1-2-73	B. Com.	LL.B.-II	
10.	Miss. Nila S. Bhatt	Ellis Bridge	12-3-75	B.A.	LL.B.-II	
11.	Shri Govindbhai T. Makwana (S/C)	Gandhi Road	1-3-79	S.S.C.	S.Y.B.Com.	
12.	Shri Ashok Somalal Panchal	Gandhi Road	15-5-72	B.Com., LL.B. (Sp.)	Diploma in Taxation Practice.	
13.	Shri Kanubhai R. Maharia (S/C)	Gandhi Road	9-10-78	B.Com.	M.Com.-I	
14.	Miss. Girisha N. Oza	Mandvi Pole	1-3-79	B.A.	LL.B.-II	
15.	Shri Shailesh V. Patel	Navrangpura	1-5-76	S.S.C.	S.Y.B. Com.	
16.	Mrs. Kalpana N. Patel	Navrangpura	27-9-74	B.A.	LL.B.-II	
17.	Miss Meeta J. Dave	Navrangpura	10-4-75	B.A.	1st LL.B.	
18.	Shri Anil R. Patel	New Cloth Market	23-8-73	B.Com.	L.L.B.-I	
19.	Shri Amresh K. Patel	Raipur Chakla	9-12-74	B.A.	L.L.B.-I	
20.	Miss Alka A. Shah	Relief Road	24-1-79	B.Sc.	M.Sc.-II	
21.	Shri Vareesh M. Patel	Relief Road	25-4-73	F.Y.B.Sc.	S.Y.B.Sc.	
22.	Shri Mohamad Hanif A. Malek	Saraspur	8-2-73	B.Com.	L.L.B.-II	
23.	Shri Prakash R. Shah	Shahpur Chakla	27-9-74	B.A., LL.B.	Diploma in Taxation Practice.	
24.	Shri Jayantkumar B. Bhatt	Mangl Chowk	10-12-73	B.Com., LL.B.	Diploma in Taxation Practice.	
25.	Shri Himanshu K. Patel	Station	17-8-78	S.S.C.	S.Y.B.Com.	
26.	Shri Keshavbhai M. Parmar (S/C)	Station	15-2-79	B.Com.	LL.B.-I	
27.	Shri Yogesh A. Shah	Station	1-3-79	B.Com.	M.Com. I	
28.	Shri Ashok Kumar Maharia (S/T)	Station	10-2-78	S.S.C.	F.Y. B.Com.	
29.	Shri Pares P. Pandya	Paldi	2-9-73	B.Com., LL.B.	LL.B.-III	

आवश्यक

नई विल्सी, 20 जनवरी, 1982

का० आ० 1292.—फेन्ड्रीय सरकार की रप्त है कि इससे उपर्युक्त प्रबन्ध सूची में विनियोगित विषय के बारे में स्टेट बैंक प्राफ मैसूर से सम्बद्ध एक श्रौतोंपक विवाद नियंत्रणको और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विवादान है :

प्रौढ़ केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना चाहनीय समझती है ;

अतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्रौतोंपक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-के और धारा 10 की उन-धारा (1) (घ) द्वारा प्रवस्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक श्रौतोंपक अधिकारण गठित करती है जिसके पैठालीन अधिकारी श्री वै. एच. उपाध्याय हैंगे, जिनका मूल्यालय बंगलौर में होगा प्रौढ़ उक्त विवाद को उक्स प्रधिकारण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्विचित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या श्री के० हृष्ण की स्टेट बैंक प्राफ मैसूर की सेवा में, बैंक की आखारीमें सितम्बर, 1976 से अगस्त, 1977 और अन्य प्रवस्त शक्तियों के दौरान सेवा के आधार पर पुनः स्वाप्त किए जाने की मान न्यायोंचित है ? यदि हाँ, तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस प्रनुषोध का हकदार है ?”

[सं० एल-12012/123/81-शी०-II (ए)]
एन० के० वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

ORDER

New Delhi, the 20th January, 1982

S.O. 1292. Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the State Bank of Mysore and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri V. H. Upadhyaya, shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Bangalore and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the demand of Shri K. Krishna for reinstatement in service of the State Bank of Mysore on the basis of the service in the bank's Branches between September, 1976 and August, 1977 and also other periods is justified ? If so, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?”

[No. L-12012/123/81-D.II(A)]

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1982

ORDER

S.O. 1293.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank, Ranchi, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 9 of 1981

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1) (d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Punjab National Bank, Ranchi and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers.—Shri C. P. Panigrahi, Personnel Officer.

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri Simhasan Bara, Dy. General Secretary, Panjab National Bank Karmachari Sangh, Bihar.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Bank.

Dhanbad, 27th February, 1982

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. L-12012/17/80-D. III (A) dated 17-2-1981 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Punjab National Bank, Ranchi in retiring Shri Ram Sabad Tiwari, Guard from service with effect from 1-1-1980 is justified ? If not to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?”

2. Shri Ram Sabad Tiwari, the concerned workman was appointed as guard in the Ranchi branch of Punjab National Bank in the year 1948. According to the management in the year 1970 the concerned workman declared his year of birth to be 1919. This was accepted by the management and this was entered in the identify form which was signed by the concerned workman. Shri Tiwari was retired from service on completion of 60 years of age with effect from 1-1-1980.

3. According to the concerned workman he was advised by the bank to produce documentary proof of his date of birth through letter dated 4-5-79, because there was no documentary evidence in the bank's record stating the year of his retirement. The documentary evidence so required was school leaving certificate, municipal certificate and in absence thereof he was required to produce a certificate of probable age from the Civil Surgeon. The concerned workman got himself examined by the Civil Surgeon, Ranchi on 11-5-79, who granted him a certificate to the effect that he was about 55 years of age on that date. The concerned workman filed before the manager the certificate of the Civil Surgeon. The plea taken by the concerned workman is that the management accepted the opinion of the Civil Surgeon and he was allowed to continue in his service. But suddenly he was asked to retire w.e.f. 1-1-1980 through letter dated 21-12-79.

4. The dispute was taken up by the union of the workman and the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C), Hazaribagh held conciliation which failed. This has given rise to the present reference.

5. The case of the P. N. Bank Ltd. is based on the agreement of service executed by the concerned workman, Shri R. B. Tiwari. This document is Ext. M 21. It was executed on 19th May, 1970. Along with the agreement there is one identity form. It bears the photograph of Shri R. B. Tiwari with his signature and date. The date mentioned is 23-4-70. In this identity form column No. 8 shows the year of birth in 1919. In column No. 12 his date of appointment is 28-10-48. It is not disputed that the concerned workman was appointed on 28-10-48. It is also not in dispute that the photograph on the identity form was signed by the concerned workman on 23-4-70. This shows that after nearly 22 years of completion of service, this service agreement, Ext. M 21 was executed by Shri R. S. Tiwari. The management of Punjab National Bank Ltd. has produced no paper to show as to what was the age declared by the concerned workman at the time of his appointment i.e., on 28-10-48. So far as the year of birth shown in the identity form is concerned, the simple case of the concerned workman is that he did not declare his year of birth. Apparently this form was not filled up by the concerned workman because he does not know English. He has signed the agreement as well as the identity form

in Hindi. The evidence of Shri R. S. Tiwari, WW-1 is that he was asked to sign the agreement and the identify form containing no entry whatsoever and that subsequently the entries have been filled in by the bank itself showing the year of birth to be in 1919. The Bank's case, on the other hand is that the agreement and identify form were produced by the concerned workman himself duly filled in and handed over to the manager of the bank. There is no cogent evidence to indicate that the contents of the identify form had been explained to the concerned workman by the manager or any other responsible person at the time when he had affixed his signature. With regard to mention of 1919 the year of birth there is paucity of evidence to come to a definite conclusion that this year was declared by the concerned workman himself as the year of birth. There is no evidence to show as to why the date of birth and month of birth was not declared by the concerned workman. We have nothing on the record to show as to why the date of birth of the concerned workman was not noted in the service record when he was first appointed w.e.f. 28-10-48. In this connection we have a circular, Ext. M22 which is Personnel Division Circular No. 40/80. In this circular, Staff Department, circular No. 86 dated 25-5-54 has been quoted in paragraph 1, 4 items of circular have been quoted, but in the instant case we are concerned with item No. (iii) which may be quoted herein :

- (iii) In exceptional cases of such non-matriculate employees who cannot produce any of the aforesaid proofs, the date of birth may be admitted on the basis of declaration of their age given by the employees at the time of their appointment and in case they are unable to state their exact date of birth but can state the year or the year and month of birth, 1st July or 16th of the month respectively may be treated as the date of their birth. The employees may also be required to submit a certificate of age from Civil Surgeon of the place or area in which they reside.*

On the basis of the above two things are important—(1) In the case of the concerned workman 1st July, 1979 should have been the date of superannuation, but in the instant case he has been superannuated on the 31st December, 1979, (2) He was actually required to produce a certificate of age from the civil surgeon of the place or area in which he resides. The concerned workman produced the certificate of age from the civil surgeon, Ranchi. Ext. M1 is the letter of the concerned workman dated 11-5-79 addressed to the manager, Punjab National Bank. This letter was in response to the letter of the manager, Punjab National Bank, Ranchi dated 4-5-79 under which he was required to produce a certificate of age from the Civil Surgeon. The certificate itself is Ext. M2 dated 11-5-79 granted by the Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, Ranchi. According to the certificate Shri R. S. Tiwari, guard, Punjab National Bank was examined by the Civil Surgeon and in his opinion he was 55 years of age. The certificate was signed by Shri R. S. Tiwari also and his signature was attested by the Civil Surgeon himself. It appears that the bank took the view that the concerned workman himself produced the certificate without being asked. This is apparent from Ext. M5 which is a letter dated 18-12-79 of Personnel Division, New Delhi addressed to the Regional manager, Ranchi region of the same bank. It specifically mentioned that Shri R. S. Tiwari was not required by the bank to produce certificate of age from the Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, Ranchi. This shows that Ranchi branch of the bank where the concerned workman was employed had given the impression to the superior authority of the bank that the certificate of age granted by the Civil Surgeon, Ranchi could not be relied upon because the bank has not demanded any such certificate. But admittedly this is not a fact. The manager of Punjab National Bank, Ranchi through his letter dated 4-5-79 addressed to Shri R. S. Tiwari, guard asked him a certificate of age from the Civil Surgeon. A photostate copy of the letter is on the record of the case, and not denied by the bank. It is clear that inspite of the certificate of age granted by the Civil Surgeon Ranchi the bank superannuated the concerned workman on 31st December, 1979 although he had still 5 years of service.

6. In my above discussions, I have discussed the relevant documents concerning the point in reference. The Bank has produced and proved many documents which have

no bearing upon this case and we need not discuss them. Yet there is one submission on behalf of the concerned workman and which is a subject matter of representation filed by the union of the concerned workman against his premature retirement. It was submitted in the representation dated 24-12-79 that the minimum and maximum age permissible in the bank's service for the purpose of appointment is 18 and 25 years respectively. The concerned workman joined on 28-10-48. If it was conceded that he was attained the maximum age of 25 years at the time of appointment, age of the concerned workman as on 28-10-79 would be 56 years. Admittedly the age of retirement is 60 years. It means that he had still 4 years to serve in order to complete 60 years at the time when he was made to retire. It is not the case of the bank that the normal rule of considering the age of employment at the time of appointment of the concerned workman was not followed. The point is that the Civil Surgeon estimated his age to be 55 years about six months before the concerned workman was made to retire. This is consistent with the probable age at the time of his appointment if the bank followed the rule of appointing the persons not above the age of 25 years, and not below the age of 18 years. Since the age determined by the Civil Surgeon is consistent with the probable age. I do not understand why the same was not accepted by the Bank. As I have already said that the manager of Punjab National Bank has not disclosed to his superior authorities that the age was determined by the Civil Surgeon on the basis of the letter addressed to the concerned workman by the bank manager himself. In this connection the evidence of the concerned workman, WW-1 is that the bank manager himself had taken him to the Civil Surgeon for the purpose of examination.

7. There is no substance in the workman's argument with regard to the horoscope presented in this case. The evidence of WW-1 is that it was prepared by one Pandit named Shri Seobachan Pandey. This horoscope has been marked Ext. W-5. WW-1 has said that his father had got it prepared. From this document it would appear that he was born on 8-2-1927 and was therefore about 52 years of age on 30-12-79. The evidence of WW-1 is that the Pandit who prepared the horoscope is dead and it was prepared when he was child. The horoscope of this nature is not an authenticated document as it could be easily prepared. Moreover, the concerned workman has produced it out of his own custody and his evidence is that he had kept it in a box in a room allotted to him by the bank. In this case it is an admitted position that some years before a fire had broken out in the bank premises in which the almost the entire belongings of the concerned workman had been burnt. The workman produced a long list of articles lost by him and this list is Ext. M9. The bank's contention is that if this document had been genuine, it would have been burnt in the fire. This is a good argument against the genuineness of Ext. W-5. At any rate the concerned workman has relied upon his ago as found by the Civil Surgeon and in fact that is sheetanchor of the case of the concerned workman.

8. As a result of the above discussion I have to hold that the concerned workman was 55 years of age at the time when he was superannuated. It means that he has still 5 years to serve and therefore he was prematurely retired.

9. Accordingly I have to hold that the action of the management of Punjab National Bank, Ranchi in retiring Shri Ram Sabad Tiwari, guard from service with effect from 1-1-1980 not justified. Consequently, the concerned workman is entitled to be reinstated with all the back wages and other benefits w.e.f. 1-1-1980.

This is my award.

Sd/-

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad.

[No. L-12012(17)/80-D. II (A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

धारेश

नई दिल्ली, 2 फरवरी, 1982

का०आ० 1294.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायद मनुष्यों में विनादिष्ट विवाद के बारे में मैसर्स एस०सी० कम्पनी लि०, कोठागुडम से सम्बद्ध एक आधिकारिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करता थांडीय समस्ती है;

ग्रन्त, केन्द्रीय सरकार, आधिकारिक विवाद आधिकारिक, 1947 (1947 का 14) को धारा 7-क प्रीत धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अंडे (प्र) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक आधिकारिक अधिकारण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री बी० प्रसाद राव होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय हैवराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकारण न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्षया मैसर्स एस०सी० कम्पनी लि०, बेलम्पल्ली, के प्रबन्धसंघ द्वारा
 (1) श्री ए० लक्ष्मीनारायण, केन्द्रीय मजदूर (कालानुपाती दर) को काल कैमिकल काम्प्लैक्स से येलान्टू कॉलिंगरीज में माध्यनुपाती दर के कर्मकार के रूप में स्थानांतरित करना;
 (2) कोल कैमिकल काम्प्लैक्स में कार्य कर रहे विभिन्न प्रवर्गों के कर्मकारों के कार्य वर्णन को विहित करने से इन्कार करना;
 (3) कोल की धूल में सथा मशीनरी पर कार्य करने वाले विभिन्न प्रवर्गों के कर्मकारों को वर्षियों का प्रदाय न करना।
 (4) कोल काम्प्लैक्स में कार्य करने वाले कर्मकारों को जो धूल व ताप में कार्यरत है धूल और ताप संबंधी भृतों का संवाद करने से इन्कार करना, न्यायालिन है?

यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुत्तोष का हक्कदार है।

[संख्या एल-21011/13/81-डी-4-डी]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 2nd February, 1982

S.O. 1294.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the M/s. S. C. Co. Ltd., Kothagudem and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed :

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri B. Prasada Rao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whereas the management of M/s. S. C. Co. Ltd. Bellampalli is justified :—

- (1) In transferring Shri A. Laxminarayana, Central Mazdoor (time rated), Coal Chemical Complex to Yellandu Collieries as a piece rated Worker;
- (2) In refusing to prescribe job descriptions to different categories of workmen working in Coal Chemical Complex;
- (3) In not supplying Uniforms to all categories of workmen exposed to Coal dust and machinery;
- (4) In refusing to pay Dust and Heat allowances to the workmen working in Coal Chemical Complex who are exposed to dust and heat ?

If not, what relief the workmen are entitled ?”

[No. L-21011/13/81-D.IV(B)]

New Delhi, the 9th March, 1982

S.O. 1295.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Surakachhar Colliery, P.O. Barki Mogra District Bilaspur (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5-3-1982.

BEFORE JUSTICE SHRI S. R. VYAS (RETD.) PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,
 JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No. CGIT/LC(R)(37)/80

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Surakachhar Colliery, P.O. Barki Mogra, District Bilaspur (M.P.) and their workman, Shri Bishal Singh, Loading Inspector, represented through the Chhattisgarh Khadan Karkhana Mazdoor Union P.O. Barki Mogra, District Bilaspur (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri Rambilash Shobhnath.

For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

DISTRICT : Bilaspur (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated, the 26th February, 1982

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication vide its Notification No. L-22012(50)/79-D. IV(B) Dated 7th July, 1980 :—

“Whether Shri Bishal Singh, Loading Munshi who officiated from 17th November, 1976 to 31st August, 1979 is Loading Inspector is entitled for regularisation in the post of Loading Inspector ? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled ?”

2. Briefly stated the facts giving rise to this reference are these. The workman, Shri Bishal Singh is an employee of the Western Coalfields Ltd. in the Surakachhar Colliery of Banki Mongra, District Bilaspur since 1966 as a Loading Munshi. By an order dated 17-11-1976 the Sub-Area Manager appointed him to officiate as Loading Inspector, but he was neither, according to the workman, paid the acting allowance nor regularised. The workman, therefore, filed an application under Sec. 33C(2) for computation of his acting allowance. The Labour Court allowed this application and directed the management to pay the acting allowance for the post of Loading Inspector (vide Labour Court's Order dated 31-7-1979). The workman thereafter raised the dispute about his regulation on the post of Loading Inspector. But this dispute, having failed in conciliation proceedings, has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication.

3. In the statement of claim made by the workman, it is contended that having officiated on the post of Loading Inspector from 17-11-1976 to 31-8-1979 he was entitled to be regularised on that post. This claim is based on a Company's Circular, according to which if a workman works on a higher post for more than 190/240 days either as an underground worker or as a surface worker then he is entitled to be regularised.

4. The claim is denied by the management on a number of grounds. They are—that the workman was holding the substantive post of Loading Munshi from 1-9-1966; that as per official order he was only asked to officiate as a Loading Inspector; that promotion and regularisation on a higher post is a managerial function; that promotions are in normal course, made against existing and available vacancies of posts after the cases are cleared by the Departmental Promotion Committee; that mere authorisation to work on a higher post does not confer an automatic right on a workman to claim regularisation; that in the normal course a Loading Munshi

is first promoted to the next higher post to which is the post of a Loading Inspector, that the Sub-Area Manager who had promoted the workman to officiate as a Loading Inspector was not competent to pass such an order; that the workman was only authorised to assist the Loading Inspector and not to officiate as claimed by the workmen, that before promotion can be made to any higher post the claims of all eligible workmen have to be considered and that the claim of the workman as accepted under Sec. 33-C(2) of the I.D. Act has no binding effect on the present claims made in this reference.

5. In their respective rejoinders both the parties reiterated their pleadings made in their respective statements.

6. In view of the respective contentions of both the parties, the following issues were framed on 16-9-1980 :—

ISSUES

1. Whether there is no post of a Loading Inspector in Surakachhar Colliery. If so, its effect?
2. Whether the workman is entitled to be regularised on the post of a Loading Inspector?
3. Whether Shri Bishal Singh was not appointed to officiate as a Loading Inspector in any permanent or regular post?
4. Whether the Sub-Area Manager had no authority to appoint Shri Bishal Singh to officiate as Loading Inspector?
5. Relief and costs.

7. My findings on the aforesaid issues are as under :—

Issue No. 1 :—The management has failed to prove that there was no post of a Loading Inspector in the Surakachhar Colliery.

Issue No. 2 :—The workman, Shri Bishal Singh is entitled to be regularised on the post of a Loading Inspector.

Issue No. 3 :—The management has failed to prove that Shri Bishal Singh was not appointed to officiate as a Loading Inspector in any permanent vacancy.

Issue No. 4 :—The management has failed to prove that the Sub-Area Manager had no authority to appoint Shri Bishal Singh to officiate as a Loading Inspector.

Issue No. 5 :—The workman, Shri Bishal Singh, is entitled to be regularised as a Loading Inspector as per award given below.

8. In this case, oral and documentary evidence has been given by both the parties to which I shall refer to shortly. The documents produced by the workman are the copy of the order in the previous case under Sec. 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act and applications Ex. W/1 to W/3 made by the workman for regularisation between March 30, 1979 to September 22, 1979. The workman examined himself and led no other oral evidence. On behalf of the management, the order reverting Shri Bishal Singh to the post of Loading Munshi and Minutes of a meeting between the management of the Western Coalfields Limited and representatives of the M. P. Colliery Workers Federation (INTUC) held at Nagpur on 25th, 26th and 27th April, 1978, have been filed. In his own statement Shri Bishal Singh stated that on 17-11-1976 he was appointed to officiate as a Loading Inspector. He officiated in that capacity upto 31-3-1979 when he was reverted to his substantive post of a Loading Munshi. According to him, since that Loading Inspector Shri Chatterji, was promoted he was appointed to officiate in his vacancy. Thereafter he made repeated requests vide Ex. W/1 to W/3 but he was not regularised.

9. On behalf of the management Shri P.G. Gokhale, Deputy Chief Mining Engineer, Surakachhar Colliery, has been examined. According to him, the workman Shri Bishal Singh, was working under him and in his area there was no post of a Loading Inspector. The post of Loading Inspector is in Grade I and that of Loading Munshi is Grade III Clerk. According to him, without the matter being finalised through the Departmental Promotion Committee no workman is entitled to get promotion from Grade III Clerk to Grade I Clerk and since this was not done in the case of Shri Bishal Singh he is not entitled to the promotion sought by him. He was questioned as to which was the circular to which he

has referred to in the matter of Departmental Promotion Committee, but he replied that the same was not brought by him. The management has filed a copy of the amendment to the minutes of the meeting Ex. M/1 by which certain decisions taken in the joint meeting were revised. According to this if a workman is to officiate on a higher category and continues to work on the said higher category for more than 190 days (in case of an underground worker) and 240 days (in case of a surface worker) then he shall be regularised on that post. This document is an admitted document. It is in the light of the aforesaid oral and documentary evidence that it has to be seen as to whether the issues referred to above do or do not deserve to be answered in favour of the workman.

10. Issue No. 1 : There is no satisfactory evidence given by the management that in the Surakachhar Colliery, in which the workman is employed, there is no post of Loading Inspector. If the relevant documents had been produced it could have been known as to what is the strength in the Colliery so far as the post of Loading Inspector is concerned. The order passed in previous case instituted by the workman under Sec. 33-C(2) reproduce the order dated 17-11-1976 and the same may be reproduced here for further reference :—

"Shri A. Chatterji Junior Sales Inspector of Surakachhar Colliery is hereby authorised to work as overall Incharge of Coal Despatch and Coal Billing of both the Banki and Surakachhar Collieries with immediate effect. He would be assisted by Shri P. M. Matai, Loading Inspector of Banki and Shri Vishal Singh Officiating Loading Inspector respectively in the works."

From the aforesaid order, it would be clear that Shri Bishal Singh, the workman, was appointed to officiate as Loading Inspector because of the additional charge given to Shri A. Chatterji, the Sales Inspector of the Colliery. It is, therefore, not correct on the part of the management to contend that Shri Bishal Singh was appointed on a post which did not exist in the sanctioned budget of the Surakachhar Colliery. The fact that he was appointed to officiate as a Loading Inspector clearly goes to show that there was such a post on which he was appointed. Issue No. 1 is accordingly found in favour of the workman.

11. Issue No. 3 :—In view of the order which I have reproduced in the preceding paragraph it cannot but be held that the workman, Shri Bishal Singh was appointed to officiate as a Loading Inspector. In the said case under Sec. 33-C(2) the workman had claimed wages for the post of a Loading Inspector and the claim was allowed. The order allowing that claim has become final and in view of this order passed between the same parties, the management cannot contend that he was not appointed to officiate as a Loading Inspector.

12. Issue No. 4 :—It was contended in the statement filed by the management that the Sub-Area Manager had no authority to appointment the workman as a Loading Inspector. It is a fact that such an order had been passed and in pursuance to that order for about three years the workman had worked on that post. How can the management contend that the Sub-Area Manager had no authority to appoint a workman in a officiating capacity on the post of a Loading Inspector. The management is now estopped from challenging the authority of the Sub-Area Manager's order appointing the workman, Shri Bishal Singh, to officiate as a Loading Inspector. I therefore, held that the Sub-Area Manager had the authority to appointment Shri Bishal Singh as a Loading Inspector in the Surakachhar Colliery.

13. Issue No. 2 :—It was contended that if the claim of the workman is allowed it would mean a double promotion; that before granting promotion to a particular workman respective claims of other workmen had been considered; that promotions are always made after the matter is considered by the Departmental Promotion Committee; that if an out of turn promotion is allowed in these proceedings to the workman it would result in unrest amongst the other eligible candidates; that if a workman has been appointed on a post which does not exist he cannot be regularised on that post and that the agreement Ex. W/4 regarding regularisation after a workman has worked 190/240 days is not applicable to the present case. All these contentions, in my opinion, are untenable.

14. As already held above, there was a post on which the workman was appointed to officiate. The workman actually officiated on this post from 17-11-76 to 31-8-1979. If his officiating appointment had been without due regard to the rules regarding selection by the Departmental Promotion Committee or had been made after overlooking the claims of other candidates or had been the cause of any industrial unrest, the management should not have kept quiet for three years and allowed the workman to work on a higher post for about three years. The above contentions now raised appear to be a lame excuse for denying the legitimate dues to the workman which he has earned on account of officiation on a higher post for about three years. As per Ex. W14 the workman has become entitled to be regularised on the post on which he officiated for about three years. I, therefore, hold that in the circumstances of this case, the workman is, as of right entitled to be regularised on a post of a Loading Inspector from 17-11-1976, the date from which he had been officiating continuously till he was reverted by an order dated 31-8-1979.

15. Issue No. 5 :—The workman, Shri Bishal Singh, is entitled to be regularised as a Loading Inspector from 17-11-1976 with all consequential benefits.

AWARD

Accordingly for the reasons given above, the award is that the workman, Shri Bishal Singh employed in the Surakchhar Colliery of the Western Coalfields Limited, P. O. Banki Mogra, District Bastar, is entitled to be regularised as a Loading Inspector from 17-11-1976 with all consequential benefits in the matter of his fixation of pay and other allowances admissible to that post from the aforesaid date. Both the parties shall bear their own costs as incurred in these proceedings.

S. R. VYAS, Presiding Officer
[No. L-22012(50)/79-D IV (B)]

New Delhi, the 11th March, 1982

S.O. 1296.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jhagrakhand Area of Western Coalfields Limited, Post Office South Jhagrakhand, District Surguja (M.P.) and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 5-3-1982.

BEFORE JUSTICE SHRI S. R. VYAS (RETD) PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR (M.P.)

Case No CGIT/LC(R)(6)/1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Jhagrakhand Area of Western Coalfields Limited, P.O. South Jhagrakhand, District Surguja (M.P.) and their workmen, Shri J. K. Chakravorty, Clerk Grade II represented through the M.P. Colliery Workers Federation (INTUJ), P.O. South Jhagrakhand, District Surguja (M.P.).

APPEARANCES :

For Union—Shri G. P. Sharma, Vice President
For Management—Shri P. S. Nair, Advocate

INDUSTRY: Coal

DISTRICT: Surguja (M.P.)

AWARD

Dated February 26, 1982.

This is a reference made by the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour vide Notification No. I-22012(19)/78-D IV(A) dated 12th April, 1979 for adjudication of the following dispute by this Tribunal :—

"Whether the demand of the M.P. Colliery Workers Federation of or placement of Shri J. K. Chakravorty, Clerk Grade II, in the Area Accounts, Office of Jhagrakhand Area, District Surguja in Grade I with effect from the 18th October, 1974 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The workman, Shri J. K. Chakravorty, hereinafter referred to as the workman, was Grade III Clerk in the Jhagrakhand Area of the Western Coalfields Limited, P.O. South Jhagrakhand, District Surguja. While he was working in the colliery office the management of the Colliery, herein-after referred to as the management, invited the workman and others to appear before a Selection Committee constituted for selection to the post of Grade I Clerk. The workman appeared before the selection Committee for selection to the post of Grade I Clerk. The Selection Committee, however, found him fit for selection as Grade II Clerk and not as Grade I Clerk. The workman was accordingly, vide Ex. W2 dated 16-1-1974, promoted as Grade II Clerk. He joined that post and since then vide Ex. W16, W17, W18, W19, Ex. 20 and Ex. W21 between the period July 1973 to January 1978 made representations that though selected and promoted as Grade II Clerk he was performing the duties of Grade I Clerk; that the selection was for the post of Grade I Clerk and not Grade II Clerk and that he should be promoted/regularised as Grade I Clerk. There were demands both by the workman and his Union representatives vide Exs. W30 and W31 and letters dated June 1975 and January 1976 for the workman's promotion/regularisation as Grade I Clerk. The management, however, allowed him acting allowance as a Grade I Clerk with effect from 1-8-1978 (Vide Ex. W13), but did not regularise him or confirm him in the post of Gr. I Clerk. The workman and the workman's Union representative did not feel satisfied with the aforesaid action of the management and demanded that the workman should be regularised as Grade I Clerk ever since he was called for interview for the post of Grade I Clerk and instead of being promoted as Grade I Clerk he was promoted as Grade II Clerk. Since this demand was not satisfied the dispute continued and has now been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication of the aforesaid dispute.

3. The contention of the management is that though applications were invited for the post of Grade I Clerk as alleged by the workman, the Selection Committee interviewed eligible candidates but found the workman only fit for selection as Grade II Clerk and not Grade I Clerk. Promotion, according to the management, was a managerial function and the workman could not claim promotion as of right until the management considered the claim of other workmen also through the Departmental Promotion Committee. As regards the contention of the workman that he all along been working as Grade I Clerk, it is said that the claim of the workman is not based on facts. Lastly, according to the management, ever since the workman was discharging the function of Grade I Clerk i.e. from 1st August, 1978 he is being given acting allowance as per rules. Question of regularisation and/or confirmation on this post, according to the management, can be considered only after the claims of all other eligible candidates are considered and not bypassing the prescribed mode for selection and promotion to higher post.

4. In view of these contentions raised by both the parties, the following issues were framed on 13-6-1979 :—

ISSUES

1. Whether the reference is made because—

- (a) Union did not raise the demand in May, 1978;
- (b) the reference is highly belated; and
- (c) promotion being managerial function, no industrial dispute could be said to have arisen?

2. (a) Whether Shri Chakravorty is entitled to promotion for the post of Clerk Grade I?

- (b) If so, from which date?

3. Relief and costs.

Thereafter two more questions were also formulated on 12-12-1980 which are as under :—

1. Whether the Minutes of discussion between the M.P. C.W.F. and the Western Coalfields Limited dated 25th to 27th April 1978 in respect of Issue No 1(d) (Annexure W.W. 39) have a binding effect on the parties?

2. Whether any person officiating on a higher category for a period of 190/240 days in that post can be regularised ignoring the claims of senior persons and without referring the case to the D.P.C. for Promotion to a higher post?

5. Oral and documentary evidence given by both the parties in support of their respective contentions have been considered by me. My findings on the aforesaid issues and questions are as under :—

6. Issue No. 1(a) & (b) :—This issue is not of any significance as in view of the fact that both the parties have not only led evidence but argued the case on merits also. Accordingly the question as to whether the dispute was raised or not raised by the workman before the order of reference was made, does not remain of any particular importance. Accordingly, no finding on Issue No. 1 (a) and (b) is necessary.

7. Issue No. 1(c) & 2(a) & (b) :—The workman is entitled to be regularised as Grade I Clerk from the date he is being given acting allowance i. e. from 1-3-1978.

8. Issue No. 3 :—As per award given below.

9. Question No. 1 :—(As reproduced above in para. 4). The discussions do not indicate that they have any binding effect on the parties. They are indicative of only certain matters discussed between the parties.

10. Question No. 2 :—In the light of the view that I have taken above it is not necessary to decide this question on merits.

REASONS FOR THE ABOVE FINDINGS .

11. Before referring to the documentary evidence given by both the parties I may refer to oral evidence given by the workman, Shri J. K. Chakravorty (W.W.1). In his statement he stated that though holding the substantive post of Grade II Clerk he is officiating as Grade I Clerk from 1-8-1978. He also says that the duties which he is performing since 1974 while holding the substantive post of Grade II Clerk are the same which are being performed by his colleagues S|Shri R. N. Sengupta and S. K. Mukherjee who are holding the substantive post of Grade I Clerk. He admits that he is getting acting allowance of Grade I Clerk from 1978. As regards his selection as Grade II Clerk he stated that while working as a Grade III Clerk he was called for interview for the post of Grade I Clerk but he joined the post of Grade II Clerk under protest as the selection was not for the post of Grade II but of Grade I Clerk. In his cross-examination, he admits that he has no personal knowledge regarding the nature of work done by S|Shri R. N. Sengupta and Mukherjee; that he had not seen their duty list and that they are not working before him. The above is the only oral evidence given by the workman.

12. It would be clear from his evidence that initially he was a casual mazdoor, then promoted as a Grade III Clerk and later on as Grade II clerk. His main grievance appears to be that though the Selection Committee had interviewed him to consider his merits for promotion as Grade I Clerk but the management promoted him only as Grade II and not as Grade I Clerk. With regard to these contentions my view is that in a case of this nature where a Selection Committee is constituted by the management for selection to promotion to higher posts it is not obligatory on the part of the management that every person interviewed should be selected for the post for which selection is made. The Selection Authority i.e. the Selection Committee may have authority to recommend candidates for promotion and appointment to particular posts, it is then for the management to either accept or reject the recommendations of the Selection Committee. The final decision in all such cases rests with the appointing authority and not Selection Committee or the Departmental Promotion Committee. However, if the Selection Committee, as in the present case, thought fit that the workman was fit not for the post of Grade I Clerk but for the post of Grade II Clerk then there was nothing which can be said to unfair. When posts fall vacant in higher categories all eligible persons are free to apply for that post. The applicant being eligible for consideration applied for that post was interviewed but not selected for the post of Grade I Clerk. It is not said that there was anything unfair on the part of the Selection Committee. The workman cannot complain as to why he was not selected for the higher post and was selected for the lower higher post. Ultimately, it was for the management to decide as to whether a Clerk Grade III should directly promoted as Grade I Clerk without considering the claims of other Grade II Clerks or should first be promoted as Grade II Clerk and should after some time have a chance for being considered on the Grade

I Clerk's post. I, therefore, find no substance in the contention of the workman that since he was called for interview for the post of Grade I Clerk he should either be deemed to have been selected for that post or that if selected for Grade II Clerk's post his selection should have been for Grade I Clerk's post.

13. It was also contended that it was unfair on the part of the management to call the candidate for selection for the post of Grade I Clerk but select clerk for Grade II only. I am unable to understand this reasoning and why this contention. It is ultimately for the appointing authority to decide either on the basis of merit, or on the basis of seniority or on the recommendations of the Selection Committee as to whether a particular workman should be given a double promotion ignoring the claims of others or should get his promotion in normal course from the lower to the next higher post. In the instant case, the management appears to have followed the normal course and I find nothing unfair or unjust. Accordingly, in my opinion, on the basis of the recommendations of the Selection Committee alone the workman cannot claim promotion to the post of Grade I Clerk from the date he was promoted as Grade II Clerk.

14. No doubt the workman had been demanding his promotion from Grade II to Grade I Clerk since after his promotion as Grade II Clerk vide Ex. W/2 dated 16-1-1974, but consistent demands made by the workman for promotion do not automatically justify his promotion. Ultimately it has to be left to the discretion of the management as to when and on what basis a workman should be promoted from the lower to the higher post.

15. It was next contended that the workman has all along, since his promotion as Grade II Clerk, been working as a Grade I Clerk. Besides some documentary evidence and the inspection report no oral evidence has been given by the management in this case. The workman in his statement has not given any indication by leading satisfactory evidence as to what exactly are the duties that are being performed by him either as a Grade II Clerk or as a Grade I Clerk. Ex. W/3 is an office order dated 24-4-1975 regarding the assignment of duties to the employees working with the management. In this order the workman along with one Shri J. P. Verma has been designated as Grade II Clerk and assigned the duties of auditing and passing of bills, keeping all necessary records, releasing security deposits, etc. etc. The duties assigned to Shri R. N. Sengupta whose name has been referred to by the workman himself, as mentioned in the office order, are entirely different. They are dealing with the Sales Tax matters, maintenance of Area Finance Manager's registers relating to bank documents and bills, preparation of various returns to Nagpur, capital commitment and cash flow statements and such other work as may be assigned to him. It would thus appear that according to the office order the nature of duties assigned to the workman and Shri R. N. Sengupta, Grade I Clerk, are different both in nature and extent. The applicant workman, therefore, cannot equate his duties with the duties performed by Shri R. N. Sengupta. In the joint inspection report submitted in compliance with the orders of this Tribunal the duties said to have been performed by the workman were as under :—

"D.R.R. Vouchers, requisition register, order register and receipt register. These registers were necessary to check as they are connected with the vouchers.

From the records, it has been revealed that Shri J. K. Chakravorty performs the job of tallying, checking of vouchers and auditing and also supplies. He is doing these works since 18-1-1974."

This inspection report, in my opinion, does not in any way help to solve the question before this Tribunal. If there had been any office order specifying the duties performed by Grade I and Grade II Clerk and further if it had been shown that according to the office orders specifying the duties to various categories of clerk, the workman has been performing the duties of Grade I Clerk then it could have been said as to what exactly are the responsibilities shouldered by the workman in the field of various categories of grades of clerks. This inspection report only shows that the duties mentioned above are being performed by the workman from 18-1-1974. Since they are not conclusively indicative of the performance of the duties of Grade I Clerk, the inspection report, in my opinion, is not of any conclusively evidentiary value.

16. Accordingly, I hold that the workman is not entitled to be regularised/promoted as Grade I Clerk from the date the management promoted him as Grade II Clerk.

17. Even assuming, for which there is no evidence, that the Selection Committee had recommended/selected him for Grade I Clerk's post even then the question would be as to whether the appointing authority was bound to appoint him without considering the respective claims of other persons working on the post of Grade II Clerk. There is no evidence that the Selection Committee had found the workman of such extraordinary merit so as to justify him double promotion from the post of Grade III Clerk to Grade I Clerk. It has also to be considered that on the date on which the workman was selected for being appointed to the post of Grade II Clerk whether there were any vacancies of Grade I Clerk's post on which the workman could have been appointed by giving him double promotion. If the workman had so desired he could have got produced the necessary documents from the management and then could show that considering the vacancies existing in the cadre of Grade I Clerk, he was the only person entitled to be appointed by giving double promotion. In the absence of any satisfactory evidence I am unable to accept the contention of the workman that on the date he was selected and appointed to the post of Grade II Clerk he was, as of right, entitled to be promoted directly as Grade I Clerk.

18. Accordingly my findings, as already stated above, on Issues Nos. 1(c) and 2(a) and (b) are that the workman is not entitled to be regularised as Grade I Clerk except from August 1, 1978 from which date he is acting as a Grade I Clerk and is being paid acting allowance also.

19. Issue No. 3.—As per award given below,

20. Question Nos. (1) and (2).—The discussions between the M.P.C. Workers Federation and the management of the Western Coalfield Limited though do not have a binding effect on either party but they are only indicative of the matters discussed. In view of the fact that the applicant workman is being given the relief of being regularised as a Grade I Clerk from 1-8-1978 no answer to Question No. 2 is necessary.

21. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the award is that with effect from 1st August, 1978 the workman, Shri J. K. Chakravorty, should be regularised as Grade I Clerk and should be paid the wages and all other allowances admissible to the post of Grade I Clerk. He shall be deemed to have been appointed on promotion from the post of Grade II Clerk to Grade I Clerk from the aforesaid date i.e. 1st August, 1978. He shall be entitled to all consequential benefits in the matter of fixation of pay and all other allowances admissible to the workman under the rules in force. In the circumstances of the case, both the parties are directed to bear their own costs as incurred.

S. R. VYAS, Presiding Officer
[No. L-22012(19)/78-D.IV(B)]
S. S. MEHTA, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 6 फरवरी, 1982

कांगड़ा 1297-—भैंसर्म कामारी मेटलस एंड ग्लोबस लिमिटेड,
ज्याइट फैक्ट्री, जाकर नहादेवपुरा, बंगलोर-48 (जिसे हमें
इसके पश्चात उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य
निधि और प्रकर्ण उपनिधि अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19)
(जिसे हमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17
की उपधारा (24) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया
है;

प्रीत केन्द्रीय गरकार का समाधान ही यहा है कि उक्त स्थापन के
कर्मचारी किसी प्रथक श्रिंखला या प्रेमियम का संदाय किए बिना ही,
भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन
बीमा के रूप में फायदा उठा रहे हैं प्रीत ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये
फायदे न कामदों से अधिक अनुकूल ही जो कर्मचारी निश्चेप महबूब
बीमा स्कीम, 1976 जिसे हमें इसमें पश्चात उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है
के अधीन अनुमेय हैं।

प्रत. बेग्दर्द य गरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (क) द्वारा सदस्य शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और इसमें उपायद अनुदूत में पर्याप्त शर्तों के अवधि रखते हुए, उक्त स्थापन को तेज वर्ष के अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम के सभी उत्तराधीनों के प्रवर्धन से छूट देंगे हैं।

प्रत्यक्षी

1. उक्त स्थापन ने राबंध में नियोजित प्रदेशित भविष्य निधि आयुक्ता, दर्नाटक का ऐसी विवरणों में जो आगे ऐसे लेख, ग्रंथों तथा निरेक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएं प्रदान करते हों केन्द्रीय गरकार समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरेक्षण प्रभागों का प्रत्येक भाग के समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भर्ते संबंध करेगा जो केन्द्रीय गरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (क) के छूट (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निर्दिष्ट करें।

3. सामूहिक वै सा स्कीम के प्रशासन में, जिसके प्रत्येक लेखाधीनों का रखा जाता, विधियों का प्रक्षुल किया जाना, वै सा प्रेमियम का संदाय, लेखाधीनों को अन्तरण, निरेक्षण प्रभागों का संदाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभा अधीय का उक्त नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यहा प्रत्येकित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, प्रीत जब कभी उनमें संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की बहुमत्त्व की भाषा में उसका मुख्य बातों का अनुवाद, स्थापन के सूचनापट पर प्रवर्णित करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, जो कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त किसी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाना है तो, नियोजक, सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त दर्ज करेगा और उसकी बाबत प्रवर्त्य प्रेमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम की सदत करेगा।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों के उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाए जाने हैं तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुचित रूप से वृद्धि दी जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा जिससे कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक आरुह्य हों, जो उक्त स्कीम के प्रधान अनुमेय हैं।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम किसी बात के होते हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के अधीन संवेद्य रकम उम रकम से कम है जो कर्मचारी का उम दशा में संदेय होती जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता हो, नियोजक कर्मचारों के विधिक वार्गिक/नामनिर्देशनी को प्रतिक्रिया के सभी दोनों रकमों के अन्तर से बराबर रकम का संदाय करेगा।

8. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के उपलब्धोंमें कोई भी संशोधन, प्रावेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, कन्ट्रिक के पूर्ण अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जाएगा और जहाँ किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ते हों सभावना हो वह, प्रावेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन बताने से पूर्ण कर्मचारियों को अपना दृष्टिकोण स्पष्ट करने का युक्तिपूर्वक अवसर देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन वहने अपना चुका है, अधीन नहीं रह जाते हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों परों प्राप्त होने वाले फायदे किसी रीत से कम हो जाते हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक उस नियत तारीख के भीतर जो भारतीय जीवन वीमा निगम नियम करे, प्रोभियम का संदाय करने में अनुकूल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्यवस्था हो जाने दे दिया जाता है तो छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रोभियम के संदाय, भारत में किए गए किसी अधिकार की दशा में, उन मृत भवस्यों के नामनिर्देशियों या विधिक वारिसों को जो यदि यह, छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अनुगत हो, वीमा फायदों के संदाय का उत्तराधिकार नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक, इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी मृत्यु की मृत्यु होने पर उसके हकड़ार नामनिर्देशियों/विधिक वारिसों को बीमाहृत रकम का संदाय मतलबा से और प्रत्येक दशा में भारतीय जीवन वीमा निगम से बीमाहृत रकम प्राप्त होने के सात दिन के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[स० एम-35014/65/81-पी०एफ० ३]

New Delhi, the 6th February, 1982

S.O. 1297.—Whereas Messrs Kamani Metals and Alloys Limited, White Field Road, Mahadevpura Post; Bangalore-48, (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds' and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees' Deposit-linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for a period for three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Karnataka and, maintain such accounts and provide for such facilities for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts Submission of returns, payment of insurance premia, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges, etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display, on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amendment alongwith a translation of the salient features there in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Where an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund of the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act, is employed in this establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employers under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under

the said scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner Karnataka and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced to any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium within the due date, as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any, made by the employer in payment of premium etc., the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominee or legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, will be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the member covered under the scheme, the employer in relation to the said establishment shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs entitled for it and in any case within 7 days of the receipt of the sum assured from the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

[S. 35014/65/81-PF.II]

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 8 मार्च, 1982

का०आ० 1298—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य वीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) (जिसे इसके बाद उक्त अधिनियम कहा जाएगा) की धारा 91ए के साथ पठित धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त वार्तायों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत सरकार के थम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1532, दिनांक 2 मई, 1981 के अनुकम में, तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस प्रायोग के (1) आटो वर्कशाप, कैम्प, (2) मैकेनिकल एंड इलेक्ट्रिकल वर्कशाप, सबरमती, अहमदाबाद, (3) सेन्ट्रल वर्कशाप, वडोदा और (4) ग्रोफीशियल एंड ट्रिमिं इन्स्टीट्यूट वर्कशाप, वेहराइस का० पहली जुलाई, 1981 से 30 जून, 1982 तक जिसमें यह तारीख भी सम्मिलित है, की अवधि के लिए उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट की गते निम्नलिखित हैं, अधिकृत-

(1) उक्त कारबाने का नियोजक, उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके दोगांने उस कारबाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवर्तमान था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणियाँ ऐसे प्रलैप में और ऐसी विवरणियों महिले थे, जो कर्मचारी राज्य वीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के प्रधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी:

(2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के प्रधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक, या निगम का इस नियम प्राविहृत कोई अन्य परदारी—

(1) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के प्रधीन, उक्त अवधि की बाबत वी गई किसी विवरणी की विवरणियों को संत्यापित करने के प्रयोगार्थ; या

- (2) यह अधिनियम करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (भारतीय) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अधिकारी, उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गये हैं या नहीं ; या
- (3) यह अधिनियम करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियंत्रित द्वारा दिए गए उन फार्थों को, जिसके प्रतिफल स्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के आधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और बस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं ; या
- (4) यह अधिनियम करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अधिकारी द्वारा, भव उक्त कारबाही के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबन्ध प्रत्यक्ष है, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबन्धों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं ; .

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिये सशक्त होगा —

- (क) प्रधान या अध्यक्षित नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त नियोजक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक ममक्षता है ; या
- (ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अध्यक्षित नियोजक के प्रधानाधीन किसी कारबाही, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उक्ति समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के संदर्भ से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहिर्यां और अन्य वस्तुबंधों, ऐसे नियोजक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने वें, या उह ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे वे आवश्यक ममक्षते हैं ; या
- (ग) प्रधान या अध्यक्षित नियोजक को, उसके अधिकारी या सेवक की, ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारबाही, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर, में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त नियोजक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना ,
- (घ) ऐसे कारबाही, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबृही या अन्य वस्तुबंध की नकल तैयार करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना ।

[फाईल संख्या प-38014/39/80 एच.आई.०]

उपाध्यात्मक शापन

इस मामले में पूर्वाधिकी प्रभाव में छूट देनी आवश्यक हाँ गई है, व्यापक छूट के लिये प्राप्त आवेदन-पत्र की कार्रवाई पर समय नहा । तथापि, यह भी प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि पूर्वाधिकी प्रभाव में छूट देने से किसी के हित पर ग्रेनल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा ।

New Delhi, the 8th March, 1982

S.O. 1298.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 read with section 91A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), (hereinafter referred to as the said Act) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour S.O. No. 1532 dated the 2nd May, 1981, the Central Government hereby exempts (1) Auto Workshop, Cambay; (2) Mechanical and Electrical Workshop, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad; (3) Central Workshop, Baroda and (4) Geophysical and Research and Training Institute Workshop, Dehradun, belonging to the Oil and Natural Gas Commission from the operation of the said Act for the period from the 1st July, 1981 upto and inclusive of the 30th June, 1982.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing

such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(2) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of,—

- verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 of the said Act for the period; or
- ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
- ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
- ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the said Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory;

be empowered to—

- require the principle or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in-charge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or factory, establishment, office or other premises.
- make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[No. S-38014/39/80-HI]

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case, as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of any body adversely.

कांग्रेस 1299—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91 के साथ पठित धारा 88 द्वारा प्रवेश प्रक्रियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, और भारत सरकार के अम भवानीय की अधिसूचना संस्था का० आ० 1707, दिनांक 10 जून, 1980 के अमुक्तमें, गण्डीय बीज नियम लिपिटेक, नई दिल्ली के केन्द्रीय भवान और पूर्व प्रधान, दिल्ली के नियमित कर्मचारियों को पढ़ली जुलाई 1980 में 30 सितम्बर, 1982 तक, जिसमें यह बिन भी समिलित है, की और अवधि के लिए उक्त अधिसूचना के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है ।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट की शर्तें निम्नलिखित हैं, अर्थात्—

- पूर्वोक्त कारबाही, जिसमें कर्मचारी नियोजित हैं, एक रजिस्टर रखेगा, जिसमें छूट प्राप्त कर्मचारियों के नाम और पदाधिकार लिखाएं जाएं ।

- (2) इस छूट के होने हुए भी, कर्मचारी उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन ऐसी प्रशुलिष्ठाएँ प्राप्त करते रहें, जिनको पाने के लिए वे इस अधिसूचना द्वारा दी गई छूट के प्रबन्ध होने की नारंगी से पूर्व/पश्चात् अधिकारीयों के आधार पर हकदार हो जाते;
- (3) छूट प्राप्त अवधि के लिए यदि कोई अधिकारी वहने ही किए जा सके हो तो वे वापिस नहीं किए जाएंगे,
- (4) उक्त कारबाहने का नियाजन, उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके बोगतन उग कारबाहने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रबन्धात् था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् "उक्त अवधि" कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणेया ऐसे प्रस्तुत और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी चाहे,
- (5) नियम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के अर्थात् उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरण के विशिष्टियों को सम्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; या
- (1) धारा 44 के उपधारा (1) के अर्थात् उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरण के विशिष्टियों को सम्यापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; या
- (2) यह अधिनियमित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा प्राप्तिकारी रजिस्टर और अधिकारी उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गए थे या नहीं; या
- (3) यह अधिनियमित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी नियोजक द्वारा दिए गए उन फायदों को, जिसके प्रतिकालस्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद और प्रस्तुत्या में प्रते का हकदार बना हुआ है या नहीं; या
- (4) यह अधिनियमित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अवधि के बोगतन जब उक्त कारबाहने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपवधि प्रस्तुत थे, ऐसे किहीं उपबंधों के प्रत्युत्पादन किया गया था या या नहीं, निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए सशक्त होता है—
- (क) प्रधान या अधिकारी नियोजक से अपेक्षा करता कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उत्तरोन्तर निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक मानता है; या
- (ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अधिकारी नियोजक के अधिसूचनार्थी न किसी कारबाहने स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करता और उसके प्रधान अधिकारी व्यक्ति से अपेक्षा करता कि वह अधिकारी के नियोजन और भजदरी के संदाय से संबंधित ऐसे नेतृत्व, बहिर्या और प्रत्येक दस्तावेज़, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करते हों या उन्हें ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे वे आवश्यक मानते हैं; या
- (ग) प्रधान या अधिकारी नियोजक को, उसके अधिकारी या सेवक को, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति को जो ऐसे कारबाहने स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति को जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पाये यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करता, या
- (घ) ऐसे कारबाहने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबहु या अन्य दस्तावेज़ की नकल तैयार करता या उसे उद्धरण लेना

[मंत्रालय एम-38014/31/81-पत्र. ग्राह्य]

उत्तराधिकारी का जापन

इस मामले में पूर्वपिक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देनी आवश्यक हो गई है क्योंकि छूट के लिए प्राप्त आवेदन-पत्र को कार्यवाई पर समय लगा। लक्षणीय वह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि पूर्वपिक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देने से किसी के हिस्से पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

S.O. 1299.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 88 read with section 91A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1707 dated the 10th June 1980, the Central Government hereby exempts regular employees of the Central Stores and Supply Division, Delhi belonging to the National Seeds Corporation Limited, New Delhi from the operation of the said Act for a further period with effect from the 1st July, 1980 upto and inclusive of the 30th September, 1982.

The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

- (1) The aforesaid factory wherein the employees are employed shall maintain a register showing the names and designations of the exempted employees;
- (2) Notwithstanding this exemption, the employees shall continue to receive such benefits under the said Act to which they might have become entitled to on the basis of the contributions paid prior to the date from which exemption granted by this notification operates;
- (3) The contributions for the exempted period, if already paid, shall not be refunded;
- (4) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;
- (5) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act, or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—
 - (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period; or
 - (ii) ascertaining where registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
 - (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
 - (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory be empowered to—
 - (a) required the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found incharge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
 - (b) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other

- premises, or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to have been an employee; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[No. S-38014/31/81-HI]

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1982

का०धा० 1300—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91क के साथ पठित धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के अमर भवालम की अधिनियम सं० का०धा० 2708 विनांक 18 मित्रवर, 1981 के अनुक्रम में, केन्द्रीय सरकार मैसर्स इंडियन इंग्लिश एंड फार्म स्टूटिक्स सिमिटेड अधिकेश की एंटीबोयेटिक्स प्लाट, वीरभंडा, वाटर इन लेक प्लाट अधिकेश बायोलॉजिकल प्लाट, अधिकेश और आटोरिपेयर बैंकशप, अधिकेश को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से 24 नवम्बर, 1980 से 23 नवम्बर, 1981 तक, जिसमें यह दिन भी मिलित है, एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट की शर्त निम्नलिखित है, अर्थात् :—

(1) उक्त कर्त्तव्याने का नियोजक, उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके हीरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवर्तनामान था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात उक्त अवधि कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणियां, ऐसे प्रश्न में और ऐसी विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी;

(2) नियम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक, या नियम का इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी—

(1) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि की बाबत शी गई किसी विवरणी की विशिष्टियों को संरक्षित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ ; या

(2) यह अधिनियम करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अनुकूल रजिस्टर और अधिनियम के लिए रखे गये थे या नहीं ; या

(3) यह अधिनियम करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा लिए गए उन फायदों को, जिसके प्रतिकलस्वरूप इस अधिनियम के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं ; या

(4) यह अधिनियम करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त हो, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबन्धों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं ; निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए सशक्त होगा—

(क) प्रबोध या अध्यवहित नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी अवश्यक ममता है ; या

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अध्यवहित नियोजक के अधिकाराधीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उपित्त समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और भजद्वारी

के संदर्भ से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहिरा और अन्य दस्तावेज ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनको परीक्षा करने दें, या उन्हें ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं ; या

(ग) प्रधान या अध्यवहित नियोजक को, उसके अधिकारी या सेवक की, ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति जी जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर, में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना,

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबद्धी या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल तैयार करना या उनसे उद्धरण लेना ।

[सं०एस-38014/6/81 ग्र०आई०]

व्याख्यात्मक ज्ञापन

इस मामले में भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देनी आवश्यक हो गई है, क्योंकि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा नियम से छूट देने के लिए सिफारिश देर से प्राप्त हुई तथापि यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देने से किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा ।

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1982

S.O. 1300—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 read with section 91A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 2708 dated the 18th September, 1981, the Central Government hereby exempts Antibiotic Plant, Virbhadra, Water in Lake Plant, Rishikesh, Biological Plant, Rishikesh and auto repair workshop, Rishikesh belonging to M/s. Indian Drug and Pharmaceuticals Limited, Rishikesh from the operation of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from 24th November, 1980 upto and inclusive of the 23rd November, 1981.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 ;

(2) Any inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of,—

(i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 of the said Act for the period ; or

(ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period ; or

(iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification ; or

(iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the said Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory ;

be empowered to :—

(a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or

(b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in-charge thereof to produce to such inspector or other Official and allow him to examine

such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or

(c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee ; or

(d) make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[No. S-38014/6/81-HI]

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the recommendation of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, for grant of exemption was received late. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of any body adversely.

नई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1982

का०आ० 1301,—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा प्रधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91क के साथ पठित धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और भारत सरकार के श्रम संशालन की प्रविधिसूचना सं०, का०आ० 2717 विनाक, 19 सितम्बर, 1981 के प्रत्यक्षम में केन्द्रीय सरकार दामोदर वैली कारपोरेशन के (1) 132 के भी प्रिय सब स्टेशन, कुमारधुबी, (2) 132 के०वी० ग्रीड सब स्टेशन नई सराय, दामोदर और (3) दामोदर वैली कारपोरेशन सब स्टेशन, हावड़ा को पहली जूलाई, 1981 से 30 जून, 1982 तक, जिसमें यह तारीख भी मन्दिरित है, भी प्रवधि के लिए उक्त प्रधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोत्तम छूट की शर्तें निम्नलिखित हैं, अधीतः—

(1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक, उस प्रवधि की वापत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त प्रधिनियम प्रवर्तनान या (जिसे इसमें इसके प्रवर्तन उक्त प्रवधि कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणिया, ऐसे प्रश्न में और ऐसी विविधियों महिन देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त प्रवधि की वापत देनी भी;

(2) नियम द्वारा उक्त प्रधिनियम, की धारा 45 की उपचारा (1) के अधीन नियूक्त किया गया थोरी निरीक्षक, या निगम का इस निम्न प्राधिकृत कोई प्रम्य पदधारी—

(1) धारा 44 की उपचारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त प्रवधि की वापत दी गई किसी विवरणी भी विविधियों को मर्यादित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; या

(2) यह प्रधिनियित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और प्रमिलेक्ष, उक्त प्रवधि के लिए रखे गए थे या नहीं; या

(3) यह प्रधिनियित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी, नियोजक द्वारा दिए गए उन फलयों को, जिसके प्रतिफलस्वरूप इस प्रधिनियम के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नक्व में और प्रमुख में पासे का हफदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं; या

(4) यह प्रधिनियित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस प्रवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में प्रधिनियम के उपकरण प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किसी उपबन्धों का प्रत्यालन किया गया था या नहीं;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए सशक्त होगा :—

(क) प्रधान या अध्यवधिक संनियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक समझता है; या

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अध्यवधित नियोजक के अधिभागाधीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मज़हूरी के संदर्भ से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहिर्यां और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उसकी परीक्षा करने दे, या उन्हें ऐसी जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं, या

(ग) प्रधान या अध्यवधित नियोजक को, उसके प्रभिकर्ता या सेवक की, ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर, में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास महि विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना;

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में ऐसे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबहू या अन्य दस्तावेज की प्रकाश तैयार करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।

[सं० एस-38014/44/81/एच०आर०]

व्याख्यातमक ज्ञापन

इस ज्ञापन में भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देनी आवश्यक हो गई है क्योंकि छूट के लिए प्राप्त आवेदन पत्र पर कार्यवाही करने में समय लगा। तथापि, यह प्रमाणित किया जाना है कि पूर्वपक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देने से किसी के हित पर प्रतिक्रिया प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

S.O. 1301.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 read with section 91A of the Employees State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 2717 dated the 19th September, 1981, the Central Government hereby exempts (1) 132 K. V. Grid sub-station, Kumardhubi (2) 132 K.V. Grid sub-station, Naisarai, Ramgarh and (3) Damodar Valley Corporation sub-station, Howrah belonging to the Damodar Valley Corporation from the operation of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 1st July 1981 upto and inclusive of the 30th June 1982.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 ;

(2) Any inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of,—

(i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 of the said Act for the period ; or

(ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period ; or

(iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification ; or

(iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the said Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory ;

be empowered to :—

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or
- (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in-charge thereof to produce to such inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or
- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee ; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from, any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[No. S-38014/44/81-HI]

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of any body adversely.

नई विस्ती, 18 मार्च, 1982

का०धा० 1302.—मैसर्स गुजरात आयुर्वेद विकास मंडल फारमेसी, गुनागढ़ (गुजरात), (जिसे इसमें हमके पश्चात उक्त स्थापन कहा गया है) ने कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकोष्ठ उपबन्ध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) जिसे इसमें हमके पश्चात उक्त अधिनियम कहा गया है) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) के अधीन छूट दिए जाने के लिए आवेदन किया है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाजान हो गया है कि उक्त स्थापन के कर्मचारी किसी पृथक अभियांत्रिय या प्रीमियम का सवाय किए बिना ही, भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम की सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन जीवन बीमा के रूप में कायाक्रांत उठा रहे हैं और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये कायाक्रांत उठा रहे हैं और ऐसे कर्मचारियों के लिए ये कायाक्रांत उठा रहे हैं जो कर्मचारी निषेध सहबद्ध बीमा स्कीम, 1976 (जिसे इसमें हमके पश्चात उक्त स्कीम कहा गया है) के अधीन उक्त अनुश्रूत्य हैं;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करने हुए और इसमें उपबन्ध अनुसूची में विनिरिट शर्कियों के अधीन रहने हुए, उक्त स्थापन को तीन वर्षों की अवधि के लिए उक्त स्कीम के सभी उपबन्धों के प्रवर्तन से छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजन प्रादेशिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, गुजरात, को ऐसी विवरणियों भेजेगा और ऐसे लेखा रखेगा तथा निरीक्षण के लिए ऐसी सुविधाएं प्रशान करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार समय-समय पर निरिट करे।

2. नियोजक, ऐसे निरीक्षण प्रभारों का प्रन्येक माम की समाप्ति के 15 दिन के भीतर संदाय करेगा जो केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 17 की उपधारा (3क) के छंड (क) के अधीन समय-समय पर निरिट करे।

3. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम की प्रशान में, जिसके अन्तर्गत लेखाओं का रखा जाना विवरणियों का प्रस्तुत किया जाना, बीमा प्रीमियम का सवाय, लेखाओं का अन्तरण, निरीक्षण प्रभारों का सवाय आदि भी है, होने वाले सभी व्ययों का वहन नियोजक द्वारा किया जाएगा।

4. नियोजक, केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा यथा अनुमोदित सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के नियमों की एक प्रति, और जब कभी उत्तर संशोधन किया जाए, तब उस संशोधन की प्रति तथा कर्मचारियों की अनुमत्य की भाषा में उसकी मुख्य बातों का प्रनुवाव, स्थापन के सूचनापट पर प्रदर्शन करेगा।

5. यदि कोई ऐसा कर्मचारी, कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि का या उक्त अधिनियम के अधीन छूट प्राप्त कियी स्थापन की भविष्य निधि का पहले ही सदस्य है, उसके स्थापन में नियोजित किया जाना है ता, नियोजक, सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के सदस्य के रूप में उसका नाम तुरन्त बदल करेगा और उसकी बाबत आवश्यक प्रीमियम भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम को संदर्भ करेगा।

6. यदि उक्त स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों का उपलब्ध फायदे बढ़ाए जाने हैं तो, नियोजक सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को उपलब्ध फायदों में समुक्ति रूप से वृद्धि की जाने की व्यवस्था करेगा जिसमें कि कर्मचारियों के लिए सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के अधीन उपलब्ध फायदे उन फायदों से अधिक अनुकूल हो, जो उक्त स्कीम के अधीन अनुश्रूत्य है।

7. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम में किसी बात के होने हुए भी, यदि किसी कर्मचारी की मृत्यु पर इस स्कीम के प्रयोग संवेद्य रकम उस रकम से कम है जो कर्मचारी को उस दशा में संदर्भ होनी जब वह उक्त स्कीम के अधीन होता हो, तो, नियोजक कर्मचारी के विधिक वारिसनामनिर्देशियों को प्रतिक्रिया के रूप में दोनों रकमों के अंतर के अनुपरांत रकम का संदर्भ करेगा।

8. सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के उपबन्धों में कोई भी संशोधन, प्रारंभिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, गुजरात के पूर्ण अनुमोदन के बिना नहीं किया जाएगा और जहां किसी संशोधन से कर्मचारियों के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ने की समाजान हो वहां, प्रारंभिक भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, अपना अनुमोदन देने से पूर्व कर्मचारियों को अपना वृद्धिकोण स्पष्ट करने का युक्तियूक्त अवमरण देगा।

9. यदि किसी कारणवश, स्थापन के कर्मचारी, भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम को उस सामूहिक बीमा स्कीम के, जिसे स्थापन पहले अपना चुका है, अधीन नहीं रह जाने हैं, या इस स्कीम के अधीन कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त होने वाले कायाक्रांत रकम से कम हो जाने हैं, तो यह छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

10. यदि किसी कारणवश, नियोजक उस नियन नारीब के भीतर जो भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम नियत करे, प्रीमियम का संदाय करने में असफल रहता है, और पालिसी को व्यवगत हो जाने दे दिया जाता है तो, छूट रद्द की जा सकती है।

11. नियोजक द्वारा प्रीमियम के संदाय, आदि में किए गए किसी व्यक्तिकरण की दशा में, उन मूल सदस्यों के नामनिर्देशियों या विधिक वारिसों को यदि यह छूट न दी गई होती तो उक्त स्कीम के अन्तर्गत होने, बीमा फायदों के संदाय का उत्तराधिकृत नियोजक पर होगा।

12. उक्त स्थापन के संबंध में नियोजक, इस स्कीम के अधीन आने वाले किसी सदस्य की मृत्यु होने पर उसके हक्कदार नामनिर्देशियों विधिक वारिसों को बीमाकृत रकम का संदाय नत्परता से और प्रत्येक दशा में भारतीय जीवन बीमा नियम से बीमाकृत रकम प्राप्त होने के भाल दिन के भीतर सुनिश्चित करेगा।

[म० ए० ३५०१४/१/८१-प०४००-२]

प० क० भटाराई, द्वारा मन्त्रि

New Delhi, the 18th March, 1982

S.O. 1302.—Whereas Messrs Gujarat Ayurved Vikas Mandal Pharmacy, Near Grishmakunj, Joshipura Rly. Station, Near Junagadh (Gujarat) (hereinafter referred to as the said establishment) have applied for exemption under sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) (hereinafter referred to as the said Act);

And whereas, the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the said establishment are, without making any separate contribution or payment of premium, in enjoyment of benefits under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India in the nature of Life Insurance which are more favourable to such employees than the benefits admissible under the Employees Deposit-linked Insurance Scheme, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as the said Scheme) :

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2A) of section 17 of the said Act and subject to the conditions specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government hereby exempts the said establishment from the operation of all the provisions of the said Scheme for three years.

SCHEDULE

1. The employer in relation to the said establishment shall submit such returns to the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Gujarat and, maintain such accounts and provide for such facilities for inspection, as the Central Government may direct from time to time.

2. The employer shall pay such inspection charges as the Central Government may, from time to time, direct under clause (a) of sub-section (3A) of section 17 of the said Act, within 15 days from the close of every month.

3. All expenses involved in the administration of the Group Insurance Scheme, including maintenance of accounts Submission of returns, payment of insurance premiums, transfer of accounts, payment of inspection charges, etc. shall be borne by the employer.

4. The employer shall display, on the Notice Board of the establishment, a copy of the rules of the Group Insurance Scheme as approved by the Central Government and, as and when amended, alongwith a translation of the salient features thereof, in the language of the majority of the employees.

5. Where an employee, who is already a member of the Employees' Provident Fund or the Provident Fund of an establishment exempted under the said Act, is employed in this establishment, the employer shall immediately enrol him as a member of the Group Insurance Scheme and pay necessary premium in respect of him to the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

6. The employer shall arrange to enhance the benefits available to the employees under the Group Insurance Scheme appropriately, if the benefits available to the employees under the said scheme are enhanced, so that the benefits available under the Group Insurance Scheme are more favourable to the employees than the benefits admissible under the said Scheme.

7. Notwithstanding anything contained in the Group Insurance Scheme, if on the death of an employee the amount payable under this scheme be less than the amount that would be payable had employee been covered under the said Scheme, the employer shall pay the difference to the legal heir/nominee of the employee as compensation.

8. No amendment of the provisions of the Group Insurance Scheme shall be made without the prior approval of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner Gujarat and where any amendment is likely to affect adversely the interest of the employees, the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall before giving his approval, give a reasonable opportunity to the employees to explain their point of view.

9. Where, for any reason, the employees of the establishment do not remain covered under the Group Insurance Scheme of the Life Insurance Corporation of India as already adopted by the establishment, or the benefits to the employees under this Scheme are reduced to any manner, the exemption shall be liable to be cancelled.

10. Where, for any reason, the employer fails to pay the premium within the due date as fixed by the Life Insurance Corporation of India, and the policy is allowed to lapse, the exemption is liable to be cancelled.

11. In case of default, if any, made by the employer in payment of premium etc., the responsibility for payment of assurance benefits to the nominee or legal heirs of deceased members who would have been covered under the said Scheme but for grant of this exemption, will be that of the employer.

12. Upon the death of the member covered under the scheme, the employer in relation to the said establishment shall ensure prompt payment of the sum assured to the nominee/legal heirs entitled for it and in any case within 7 days of the receipt of the sum assured from the Life Insurance Corporation of India.

[S-35014/1/81-PF-II]

A. K. BHATTARAI, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली 19 फरवरी, 1982

का.ओ.आ० 1303.—भौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 36क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार अम मंत्रालय भारत सरकार के आदेश संख्या का.ओ. 2478 तारीख 10 अप्रैल 1981 का भारत के राजपत्र के भाग II खण्ड-3 उपखण्ड (ii) में पृष्ठ 3143 पर तारीख 19 सितम्बर, 1981 को प्रकाशित हुआ, में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करते हैं, अर्थात् :—

उपर्युक्त आदेश की अनुसूची की द्वितीय पंक्ति में “56 और 57” सब्द और अंकों के स्थान पर “—56 से 59” सब्द और अंक रखे जायें।

[सं० एन०-31025(1)/81-डी०-4-ए०]
टी०बी० सीतारमन, डेस्क अधिकारी

ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th February, 1982

S.O. 1303.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 36A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government makes the following amendment to the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 2478 dated 10th April, 1981 published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 19th September, 1981 at page 3143 namely :—

In the Schedule to the said Order, in the second line, for the word and figures “56 and 57”, the word and figures “56 to 59” shall be substituted.

[No. L-31025(1)/81-D.IV(A)]
T. B. SITARAMAN, Desk Officer

आदेश

नई दिल्ली 25 फरवरी, 1982

का.ओ.आ० 1304.—केंद्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपाधा अनुसूची में विनियोजित विषय के बारे में इंडिया सीमेन्ट लिमिटेड संकरी के प्रबन्धनात्मक सम्बद्ध एक भौद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उसके कर्मकारों के बीच विचारात है ;

और केंद्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायिक विवाद के विषये नियमित करना चांसलीय समझती है ,

परन्तु केंद्रीय सरकार भौद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक भौद्योगिक अधिकारण गठित करती है जिसके पीड़ियोंमें अधिकारी श्री टी० सुर्दर्शनम डेनियल

हींगे जिनका मुख्यालय मप्रास में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त प्रधिकरण को न्यायानिर्णयन के लिए निर्वैशिष्ट करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैसेंट इंडिया सिमेंट लिमिटेड संकरी के साईम स्टोन खदानों में काम करने वाले कामगारों की मनुष्यानुक में वी गई मांगें व्यायोचित हैं? यदि हाँ तो कामगार किस अनुतोष के प्रधिकारी हैं?

अनुसूची

1. सारे कामगारों को रहने के क्वार्टर्स की व्यवस्था;
2. ब्रेकरस, लॉडर्स आर्थ लॉडर्स और जेली कामगारों को यूनिफार्म देने की मांग।
3. खदान से निवास स्थान और वापसी के लिये मुफ्त यातायात की व्यवस्था।
4. कामगारों के रहने के स्थान पर पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था।

[सं. एल. 29011/40/81-डी-III(बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 25th February, 1982

S.O. 1304.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an Industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Dalmia Dadri Cement Limited, Charkhi Dadri and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constituted an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Sudarsanam Daniel shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demands of the workmen of Lime Stone Quarry of Messrs India Cements Limited, Sankari West given in the Annexure are justified. If so, what relief are the workmen entitled?"

ANNEXURE

1. Provision of quarters to all the workmen.
2. Supply of uniform to Breakers, Loaders, Earth Loaders and Jelly workers.
3. Provision of free transport from the quarry to residence and back.
4. Supply of water at the dwelling place of workmen.

[No. I-29011/40/81-D-III(B)J]

आवेदन

नई विस्ती 9 मार्च 1982

का० आ० 1305.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की रुपये है कि इससे उपर्युक्त अनुसूची में विविधिष्ट विषय के बारे में नैसर्ग डालमिया दादरी सिमेंट लिमिटेड, चरखी दादरी के प्रबन्ध मंड़न से सम्बद्ध एक आधिकारिक विवाद नियोजित हो और उसके कर्मकारों के बीच विवादान है:

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायानिर्णयन के लिए निवैशिष्ट करना चाहिए य समझती है;

प्रति; केन्द्रीय सरकार, आधिकारिक विवाद प्रधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 की और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अन्दर (ब) धारा प्रवत्त प्रक्रियाओं का प्रयोग करने हुए, एक आधिकारिक प्रधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठमीन प्रधिकारी श्री मूल कन्द भारद्वाज

होगे, जिनका मुख्यालय फरीदाबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त प्रधिकरण को न्यायानिर्णयन के लिए निवैशिष्ट करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या 18-3-80 में डालमिया दादरी सिमेंट लिमिटेड, चरखी दादरी के सिमेंट फैक्ट्री से संबद्ध, खदानों को बद करने को कार्यवाई व्यायोचित है यदि नहीं तो कमंकार किस अनुतोष के हक्कार हैं?

[सं. एल. 29024/1/81-डी-III (बी)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 9th March, 1982

S.O. 1305.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Dalmia Dadri Cement Limited, Charkhi Dadri and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Mool Chand Bhardwaj shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Faridabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

Whether the closure of the quarries attached to the Cement Factory of Dalmia Dadri Cement Ltd., Charkhi Dadri with effect from 18-3-80 is justified. If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

[No. L-29024(1)/81. D III (B)]

New Delhi, the 15th March, 1982

S.O. 1306.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Dalmia International, Patel Nagar, Hospet and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 8th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL IN KARNA-TAKA, BANGALORE

Dated the 2nd Day of March, 1982

Central Reference No. 4 of 1974

I PARTY

Workman represented by its President, Bellary District Mine Workers Welfare Union, 11/140, Main Bazar, Hospet.

Vs.

II PARTY

The Management of M/s. Dalmia International, Patel Nagar, Hospet.

APPEARANCES :

For the I Party.—Shri M. C. Narasimhan, Advocate, Bangalore.

For the II Party.—Sri B. T. Parthasarathy, Advocate, Bangalore.

REFERENCE :

(Government Order No. L-29012/5/74-LR.IV dated 23-4-1974)

AWARD

This is a reference made by the Central Government for adjudication of the dispute between the parties on the following points :—

"Whether the management of Messrs Dalmia International Hospital are justified in transferring Shri U. B. Theertha Rao, Stenographer in the same capacity from Hospital to their New Delhi office ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

2. The parties submitted their claim statements.

One of the contentions raised by the II Party was that the I Party Union was not competent to raise a dispute in respect of Theertha Rao who was a member of another union. For this the I Party union filed a reply contending that the said Theertha Rao was an office bearer of Dalmia Mine Employees Union and was also a member of the I Party union as on 15-11-1973. According to him, holding office in one union and becoming a member of another union is not barred and so it was competent to raise a dispute. On 25-2-1975 the General Secretary of the I Party Union sent a letter to the Tribunal stating that the industrial dispute raised by the Dalmia Unit of the said union against the II Party and referred to the Tribunal was not properly raised and it was not responsible for the prosecutors of the case nor is interested in it. It is added that the Dalmia unit of the union was dissolved, as it did not submit any list of members nor remitted the subscription fees and cannot be treated as members of the I Party Union. On that the II Party filed a statement of objections as regards the locus standi of the I Party Union to raise the dispute which is registered as I.A No. 2. On 7-3-1975 an order was made in the order-sheet to say that since the reference is made it has to be decided on merits and the question now raised regarding the locus standi of the union will be considered on the issue as to whether the reference itself is bad on that ground. The Tribunal ordered notice to the workman himself and he sent application dated 10-3-75 stating that the union which sponsored the dispute stands dissolved and praying for permission to defend his interest before the Tribunal as an individual workman. Later he submitted an application dated 2-12-75 to say that the dispute was raised by the Dalmia Unit of the I Party Union on behalf of the workman of the II Party and as the same now stands dissolved the workman formed another union by name Iron Ore Workers Union and the workman Theertha Rao mentioned in the reference was elected as President and the said union should be impleaded. An order was passed by my predecessor on 24-6-1976, on that application for impleading the Iron Ore Workers Union. In that, he had considered six other cases relating to the termination of other employees and by the common order rejected the said application. His observation in the said order is that there was no espousal of the dispute by the union of workmen or by appreciable number of them at the date of the reference. He has stated that the dispute which was originally an individual one had not become an industrial dispute as there is nothing on record to show that individual dispute had the support of a substantial number of workmen concerned in the dispute. At para 6 therein he observed that however this shall not be construed as coming in the way of the individual workman involved in each of the references to have his say in the conduct of the proceedings before this Tribunal.

3. The above observation was of a general nature in respect of cases of dismissal as it is possible for a workman to contest the dispute in his individual capacity in view of Section 2(A) of the Act. But in the case of a transfer of a workman from one unit to another such a dispute is an individual dispute and can be treated as an industrial dispute only in case there is enough evidence to establish that the union has taken it up as a cause of the workmen by means of a resolution. The position of law in this regard has been clearly laid down in the commentary in the Law of Industrial Disputes by O. P. Malhotra Volume I Third Edition. It has been observed at page 157 in the said book that "From the rare fact that a general union, at whose instance an 'industrial dispute' concerning an individual workman is referred for adjudication, has on its roll, a few of the workmen of the establishment as its members, it cannot be inferred that the individual dispute has been converted into an industrial dispute. The Tribunal has, therefore, to consider the question as to how many of the fellow workmen actually espoused the cause of the concerned workman by participating

in the particular resolution of the union. In the absence of such determination by the Tribunal, it cannot be said that the individual dispute acquired the character of an industrial dispute, and the Tribunal will not acquire jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the dispute."

4. It has been observed at page 162 in the said book that—

"Jurisdiction of the Labour Court to proceed with and adjudicate upon an industrial dispute stems from and is sustained, until it makes an award and the same becomes enforceable, by the reference itself which has been made on the basis of an industrial dispute existing or apprehended on the date of the reference, and that the jurisdiction of the adjudicator to proceed in the matter is not in any way affected by the fact that subsequent to the date of the reference, the workers or sub-ststantial section of them, who had originally sponsored the cause, had later recanted and withdrawn from it."

At page 163 it has been observed that—

"The legal position in that when an individual worker is a party to an industrial dispute, he is a party not independently of the union which has espoused his cause and the main parties to the 'industrial dispute' before the Labour Court are, therefore the employer and the union or the workmen as a class who took up the cause of the individual workman. The individual workman is at no stage a party to the individual dispute independently of the union. The union or these workmen who have by their sponsoring turned the individual dispute into an industrial dispute, can, therefore, claim to have a say in the conduct of the proceeding before the Tribunal."

It has been further observed at page 165 that—

When there is a dispute about the validity of the reference for want of espousal the burden of proof to establish the valid espousal is on the workman.

5. With the above position of law we will have to scan the facts in the present case to find out as to whether the dispute about the transfer of the said Theertha Rao which is admittedly an individual dispute was espoused at any time by the union to convert it into an industrial dispute at the time of reference. The Tribunal also framed issues on 28-4-1978 as follows :—

1. Whether the Central Government has jurisdiction to refer the point of dispute.
2. Whether the I Party Union is competent to raise the dispute.
3. Whether the dispute is an industrial dispute.

6. After the dismissal of the application filed by the Iron Ore Workers Union for being impleaded and in view of the above observation by the Tribunal that the individual workman can proceed with the case, the workman Theertha Rao himself conducted the case through his advocate. He examined himself and another workman. According to him, he joined the Dalmia Mine Employees Union in the year 1973 and has produced Ext. W-43 as the resolution passed in the meeting of the said union appointing him as the President. WW-2 also speaks about the said Theertha Rao becoming the President of the Dalmia Mines Employees Union. The present dispute having been raised by the Ballyary District Mine Workers Welfare Union, the question for consideration is as to whether the said Theertha Rao was a member of that union and there was any espousal of his cause by the I Party union by way of a resolution or otherwise. There is absolutely no evidence on behalf of the said Theertha Rao in this regard and on the contrary there is a letter by the I Party union to say that it has no interest in the case and there was no proper espousal of the case of the said Theertha Rao by the union. On behalf of the management the General Secretary of the Dalmia Mine Employees Union is examined as MW-2 and he says that his union did not sponsor the present reference on behalf of Theertha Rao and the I Party union has no competence to raise the dispute. The evidence of MWs-3 and 4 who were the office bearers of the said Dalmia Mine Employees Union is also to the same effect.

7. It is argued on behalf of Theertha Rao that the employees of the II Party had got themselves enrolled in a batch by an application marked as Ext. A-8 by the Conciliation Officer and Ext. A-11 marked by him would show that those applicants had paid subscription for the membership to the I Party union. When the I Party union has stated that the Dalmia Unit of its union was dissolved, as the list of members or the subscriptions collected from them were not submitted to the I Party union, more production of the papers from the Conciliation Officer wherein we find the application as in Ext. A-8 or the subscription receipt book with duplicate receipts as in Ext. A-11 will not prove the fact that the 103 employees whose signatures found in Ext. A-8 had become the members of the I Party union. The I Party union being a general union and cannot be confined to the workman of the II Party, the mere proof of the fact that some of the workmen had joined the I Party union would not itself clothe the I Party union with the powers to raise the dispute. It has been observed at page 156 in the above book of the Law of Industrial Disputes that—

"Bare sponsoring of a dispute by any union is not enough. It would always be necessary to enquire whether the union which has sponsored the dispute can fairly claim a representative character in such a way that its support to the cause would make the dispute an industrial dispute. A representative character of the union has to be gathered from the strength of the actual number of co-worker sponsoring the dispute. The mere fact that a substantial number of workmen of the establishment in which the concerned workman was employed were also members of the Union would not constitute espousal. It must be shown that they participated in or acted together and arrived at an understanding by a resolution or by other means and collectively supported the dispute. The fact that an industrial dispute is supported by other workmen will have to be established either in the form of a resolution of the union of which the workman may be a member or of the workmen themselves who support the dispute or in any other manner."

8. After a notice was sent to the said Theertha Rao individually he submitted several statements and also notes of argument. He had nowhere contended that the I Party union had taken up his cause of transfer by way of a resolution on account of the support by the other co-workers in the II Party establishment to espouse the same for conciliation or for adjudication.

9. From the conciliation papers filed, it can be made out from the failure of conciliation report sent by the Assistant Labour Commissioner, that he has stated that the cause of the workman Theertha Rao was not sponsored by either of the Dalmia Mine Employees Union or the I Party union. Under such circumstances, the Central Government ought to have rejected the proposal for a reference by holding that it cannot interfere in case of an individual dispute. Hence, I hold that the reference is bad in its inception and the dispute referred is not an industrial dispute and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate on the points of reference. The above issues are answered accordingly and an award is passed rejecting the reference. Parties to bear their own costs.

[Dy. No. 735/82-D.III.B]

V. H. UPADHYAYA, Presiding Officer

S.O. 1307.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bhubaneswar in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Rourkela Steel Plant of Steel Authority of India Ltd., Rourkela and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on 9th March, 1982.

INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, ORISSA, BHUBANESWAR
PRESENT :

Shri J. M. Mohapatra, M. Com., LL.B.,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal,
Bhubaneswar.

Industrial Dispute Case No. 7 of 1979 (Central)
Dated, Camp : Rourkela, the 25th February, 1982.

BETWEEN

The employers in relation to the
management of Rourkela Steel Plant of
Steel Authority of India Ltd. Rourkela.

First Party

AND

Their workman

Second party

APPARANCES :

Shri B. K. Mohapatra,
Assistant Manager (PLIR),
Rourkela Steel Plant, Rourkela.

For the first-party

Shri B. S. Pati,
General Secretary,
Sundergarh Mining Workers'
Union, Rourkela.

For the second-party

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7-A and Clause (d) of Sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for disposal vide Order No. L-29011/12/79-D. III. B dated 24-12-1979.

"Whether the cancellation of offer of employment No. PL-OMQ-4(10)16142-16146 dated 2nd August, 1977 issued to Shri Bhimsen Patra, Khalasi at Barsua Iron Mines of Rourkela Steel Plant is justified ? If not, what relief he is entitled to ?"

2. Both the parties filed a joint petition along with a Memorandum of Settlement dated 24-9-1981 praying to pass an Award in terms of the settlement. They admitted the terms of the settlement before me and stated that they had entered into the settlement amicably out of court without any coercion or duress for industrial peace and harmony.

3. Hence I pass this Award in terms of the settlement and the Memorandum of Settlement do form part of the Award.

[No. L-20011/12/79-D. III. B]
J. M. MOHAPATRA, Presiding Officer.

MADE PARTY OF THE AWARD AGREEMENT NO. 301

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT DATED 24-9-1981
BETWEEN THE MANAGEMENT OF STEEL AUTHORITY
OF INDIA LIMITED, ROURKELA STEEL PLANT,
ROURKELA AND SUNDARGARH MINING WORKERS'
UNION REPRESENTING SHRI BHIMSEN PATRA
Representing Management :

1. Shri R. C. Mohanty,
A.G.M. (Mines & Quarries)

2. Shri P. K. Verma,
Dy. C.P.M. (NP&IR)

Representing Union :

1. Shri D. Amat,
President,
Sundergarh Mining Workers' Union

2. Shri B. S. Pati,
General Secretary,
Sundergarh Mining Workers' Union

3. Shri Bhimsen Patra

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

Shri Bhimsen Patra, a Caused worker of Barsua Iron Mines was interviewed for absorption in the regular vacancy as Khalasi. On his selection, an appointment offer was issued to him on 2-8-1977 subject to his medical fitness by the Company's Medical Officer. Sri B. Patra was found medically unfit because of short height which is one of the prescribed medical standards for operation and maintenance jobs of Plant and Mines. He, therefore, was not given employment and the offer of appointment was cancelled. Aggrieved with the cancellation of appointment offer the Sundargarh Mining Workers' Union, representing Sri Bhimsen Patra, raised an industrial dispute and on receipt of the Factual failure report, Govt. of India referred the dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Orissa and the case has been registered as I.D. Case No. 7 of 1979 (C). During the pendency of the proceedings before the aforesaid adjudicating authority both the parties after mutual discussion agreed to resolve the issue by amicable settlement before the Industrial Tribunal, on the following terms :

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

- That subject to medical fitness required for jobs other than operation and maintenance jobs in Mines Sri Bhimsen Patra, the Second Party shall be appointed in the post of Chowkidar on a basic pay of Rs. 400 per month in the scale of Rs 400-8-488 (S-1) plus Dearness Allowance and service benefits applicable to regular employees of similar category. He shall be subject to such other terms and conditions of service as are applicable other employees of his category.
- That subject to the condition at para 1 the Management of Rourkela Steel Plant will issue regular appointment offer and post Sri Bhimsen Patra in the Barsua Iron Mines within 30 days of passing of the award of the Industrial Tribunal.
- That the terms of this settlement are in full and final settlement of the industrial dispute pending before the Industrial Tribunal, Orissa and neither the Union nor the workman shall raise any other or further dispute on this account.
- That both parties will jointly approach the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Orissa Bhubaneswar on the aforesaid terms and conditions to pass an Award in terms of this settlement.

Representing Management :

(Sd. R. C. MOHANTY)

(Sd. P. K. VERMA)

Representing Union :

(Sd. B. S. PATI)

(Sd. D. AMAT)

(Sd. BHIMSEN PATRA)

WITNESSES

1. Sd. (Illegible)

2. Sd. (Illegible)

Rourkela, 24th September, 1981

आदेश १

मई दिल्ली, 17 मार्च, 1982

का०आ० 1308—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपायक अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स बी०सी० मोहन्सी एण्ड संस (प्राइवेट लिमिटेड) के प्रबल्पत्र से सम्बद्ध एक ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है:

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को स्थायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना बांधनीय समझती है;

मत: केन्द्रीय सरकार ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की आरा 7क और आरा 10 की उप-आरा (1) के अण्ड (ष) द्वारा प्रदल पक्षियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक ग्रीष्मोगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी०एस० बड़ोइ द्वारे जिनका मुख्यालय भ्रह्मदीवार में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को स्थायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करनी है।

(ब) द्वारा प्रदल पक्षियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक ग्रीष्मोगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी०एस० महापाल द्वारे जिनका मुख्यालय भुवनेश्वर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को स्थायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या कामर्का ओमाइट माइन्स के कामगारों को उसी ज्ञान में लगातार उसाधिकारी प्रबल्पत्र के मैसर्स बी०सी० मोहन्सी एण्ड संस (प्राइवेट लिमिटेड) के तहत लगातार नियोजन की मांग न्यायोचित है? यदि हाँ तो कामगार किस अनुतोष के हक्कार है?"

[सं० एल०-29024/5/81-डी०-3(बी०)]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1982

S.O. 1308.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the M/s. B. C. Mohanty & Cons. (Pvt.) Ltd., and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the power conferred by Section 7A, clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri J. M. Mohapatra shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Bhubaneswar and refers the said disputes for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Kamarda Chromite Mines for continued employment in the same mine under the successor employer namely M/s. B. C. Mohanty & Sons (Pvt.) Ltd. is justified? If so, to what relief of the workmen are entitled?"

[No. L. 29024/5/81-D-III. (B)]

आदेश

का०आ० 1309—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायक अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में धायल एंड नेचुरल गैस कमीशन बैस्टर्न रीजन बड़ीदा से सम्बद्ध एक ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को स्थायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना बांधनीय समझती है;

मत: केन्द्रीय सरकार ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की आरा 7क और आरा 10 की उप-आरा (1) के अण्ड (ष) द्वारा प्रदल पक्षियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक ग्रीष्मोगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी०एस० बड़ोइ द्वारे जिनका मुख्यालय भ्रह्मदीवार में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को स्थायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करनी है।

अनुसूची

"क्या ग्राम्यन गंड नेचुरल गैस कमीशन (बैस्टर्न रीजन) बड़ीदा के प्रबल्पत्र की बैस्टर्न रीजन जनरल मैनेजर के कार्यालय सी० और एम० डिविजन और मैट्रिक वर्कर्स बड़ीदा में कार्यरत कर्मचारियों को युनिंग ऐलाउन्स न देने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कामगार किस अनुतोष के हक्कार है?"

[सं० एल०-30011/6/81-डी०-3(बी०)]

ORDER

S.O. 1309.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Oil & Natural Gas Commission Western Region Baroda and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri G. S. Barot shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ahmedabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the Oil and Natural Gas Commission (Western Region) Baroda is justified in not paying the Drilling Allowance to their employees employed and posted in the Western Region, G.M.'s Office, C & M Division, and Central Workshop, Baroda. If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

SHASHI BHUSHAN, Under Secy.

[No. L-30011(6)|81-D.III(B)]

आदेश

का०आ० 1310—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपर्युक्त मनुसूची में विनिश्चित विषय के बारे में प्राप्त एंड नेचुल ग्रीम कमीशन से के प्रबन्धतंत्र से सम्बद्ध एक ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद नियोजनों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विवादान है।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना चाहती है;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 के अन्तर्गत विवादों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक ग्रीष्मोगिक भविकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीछासीन भविकारी श्री जी०एस० बरोट होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय अहमदाबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

भाग्यसूची

"क्या प्राप्त एंड नेचुल ग्रीम कमीशन प्रहमदाबाद के प्रबन्धकों की श्री हमेन्ड्रकुमार, एन०परमार० कंटिनैनेट लासी की 30 अप्रैल, 1980 में सेवा ममाल्य करने की कार्यवाही व्यापीचिन है? यदि नहीं, तो कामगार किस अनुसूच का हकदार है?"

[सं० एल०-30012/6/81-डी०-3गी०]

श्री भूषण, प्रबर मण्डिय

ORDFR

S.O. 1310.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Oil and Natural Gas Commission Ahmedabad and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri G. S. Barot shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ahmedabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Ahmedabad in terminating the services of Shri Harshendra Kumar N. Parmar, Contingent Khalasi w.e.f. 30th April 1980 is justified. If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

[No. L-30012(6)|81-D.III(B)]

SHASHI BHUSHAN, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 मार्च, 1982

का०आ० 1311—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह मन्त्रालय हो जाने पर कि लोकसभा में ऐसा करना अपेक्षित था, ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (३) के उपखण्ड (६) के उपबन्धों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के अमंतालय की अधिसूचना संभव। का०आ० 2486 लारीबा० 3 सितम्बर, 1981 धारा मैनेसाइट बनत उद्यग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 4 सितम्बर 1981 से छः मास की कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा ओपित किया था;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोक हित में उक्त कालावधि को छः मास की ओपर कालावधि के लिए बढ़ाया जाना अपेक्षित है,

अतः ग्रब ग्रीष्मोगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 2 के खण्ड (३) के उपखण्ड (६) के परन्तुक धारा प्रदत्त मतियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उद्यग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 4 मार्च, 1982 से छः मास की ओपर कालावधि के लिए लोक उपयोगी सेवा ओपित करती है।

[सं० एस० 11017/3/81-डी०-1(८०)]

एस० क० मारायणन, प्रबर सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd March, 1982

S.O. 1311.—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provision of sub-section (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 2486 dated the 3rd September, 1981, the magnesite mining industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 4th September, 1981.

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purpose of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 4th March, 1982.

[No. S 11017/3/81/DIA]

L. K. NARAYANAN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 9th March, 1982

S.O. 1312.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Development and Construction of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2)
DHANBAD.

Reference No. 68 of 1981

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Development and Construction of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPARANCES :

On behalf of the employers.—Shri B. Giri, Personnel Officer, M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Dhanbad.

On behalf of the workmen.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRIAL : Coal.

Dhanbad, 26th February, 1982

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. L-20012/162/81-D. III(A) dated 29-9-81 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Central Workshop, Fkra of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad that Shri Sristidhar Maharaj Electrician should be placed in category-V with effect from the 23rd June, 1975 is justified? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After the receipt of the reference notices were served upon the parties to file their written statement, and the parties took several dates to file the written statement. Ultimately, when the case was fixed for hearing today, the parties filed a memorandum of settlement. As per the terms of settlement the concerned workman, Shri Sristidhar Maharaj has been placed in category V. The management also agreed to pay to the concerned workmen arrears of wages of category V w.e.f. 23rd June, 1975. Since the terms of the settlement are beneficial both the parties, I accept the same and pass the award in terms of the settlement. The settlement is made part of the award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(162)/81-D. III (A)]

Memorandum of Settlement between the management of Central Workshop Fkra of M/s B.C.C. Ltd., and Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union

Representing Management.—Shri B. Giri, Personnel Officer, B. C. C. Ltd., JRP (D&C Divn.), Vikash Bhawan, Jharia.

Representing Union.—Shri D. Mukherjee, Secretary, Colliery Kamgar Union, Dhanbad.

SHORT RECAPITAL OF THE CASE

Shri Sristidhar Maharaj has been working as Workshop Electrician since 23rd June 1975. The workman's demand is for Cat. V wages from the date of appointment.

Sri Sristidhar Maharaj has been placed in Cat. V from 4th February, 1981.

Both the parties agreed to settle the issue on the following terms :

It is agreed to place Sri Sristidhar Maharaj Workshop Electrician in Cat. V as per Wage Board Recommendation w.e.f. from 23rd June, 1975.

It is agreed to pay the difference of wages to Sri Sristidhar Maharaj from 23rd June, 1975 to 4th February, 1981.

The management agreed to pay Sri Sristidhar Maharaj Cat. V wages w.e.f. 23rd June 1975 and the payment shall be made within 30 days from the publication of the award.

The above terms finally resolved and settle the issue involved in Reference Case No 68 of 1981.

For Workmen

(D. Mukherjee,

Secretary,

Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union,
Dhanbad.

For Employers

B. Giri, Personnel Officer,

B. C. C. Ltd. JRP (D&C. Divn)

Vikas Bhawan,
Jharia.

26-2-82

26-2-82.

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1982

S.O. 1313.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jamadoba Coal Washery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jamadoba, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of I. D. Act.

Reference No. 9 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Jamadoba Coal Washery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jamadoba, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Retd.)
Presiding Officer,

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the Workmen : Shri B. N. Sharma, Jt General Secretary, Janta Mazdoor Sangh.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, dated the 25th February, 1982

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/299/80-D. III(A) dated the 28th February, 1981, the Central Government being of opinion that an industrial dispute existed between the employers in relation to the management of Jamadoba Coal Washery of M/s Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jamadoba, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule attached to the order referred the same for adjudication to this Tribunal.

The schedule to the order reads thus:

"Where the action of the management of Jamadoba Coal Washery of Messrs Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Post Office Jamadoba, District Dhanbad in dismissing Shri Ramanuj Misra, General Mazdoor, from service is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

After notice to the parties the union representing the concerned workman has filed its written statement and the employers have filed not only their written statement but also a rejoinder to the written statement of the union.

The case of the union as per its written statement may be briefly stated thus. The concerned workman was appointed as Cat. I Mazdoor at Jamadoba Coal Washery on 17-10-77 and thereafter by letter dated 6/11-2-1978 he was confirmed in the said category with effect from 18-1-78. While he was working as Cat. I Mazdoor in February 1978 he was asked to show cause why his services will not be terminated for giving false information about his identity and relationship for securing the job. In the explanation submitted by the workman he clearly stated that as in a previous enquiry held by the management the latter was satisfied that there was no case of false representation and as the matter was dropped it was not open to the management to reopen the matter. Besides saying as above the workman also denied the accusations made against him and asserted that conceding that the accusations were true his services could not be lawfully terminated. The management not accepting the explanation given by the workman conducted a domestic enquiry arbitrarily and in gross violation of principles of natural justice. The findings arrived at in such an enquiry by the enquiry officer are not only wrong, perverse and illegal but are not justified by the evidence led in the enquiry. Inspite of this the findings of the Enquiry Officer in the domestic enquiry against the workman were accepted by the management as a result of which the services of the workman were illegally terminated with effect from 24-5-78. Thereafter Joint General Secretary of Janata Mazdoor Sangh in his letter dated 13th June, 1978 addressed to the Chief Engineer (Washeries) demanded reinstatement of the concerned workman. The management did not concede to the demand. So a dispute was raised relating to the matter of termination of service of the concerned workman before the A.L.C.(C), Dhanbad. The conciliation before A.L.C.(C) having failed the Central Govt. referred the matter for adjudication to this Tribunal. The order of dismissal of the concerned workman from his service is not in accordance with certified Standing Orders of the company. The management also acted without jurisdiction in initiating a disciplinary proceeding against the workman. The misconduct for which the workman was held guilty not being one as per the provisions of certified Standing Orders the impugned order of dismissal cannot be sustained in law. In these circumstances the union prays that the impugned order of dismissal should be vacated and the concerned workman be reinstated with full back wages.

The case of the employers as per their written statement and rejoinder is as follows. Janata Mazdoor Sangh is not a recognised union nor a representative union functioning at Jamadoba Coal Washery. There is long established practice in the company to appoint a dependent of a workman of the company. According to this practice the workman has to enroll the names of his dependents. In pursuance to this one Sri Darbari Dubey, Ex-workman of the company during period of his service had enrolled the name of the concerned workman as his (Dubey) son-in-law dependent in the register maintained at Coal Washery Plant. When the turn of employment of the concerned workman came on the strength of service of Darbari Dubey a declaration was given by Dubey that the concerned workman was his son-in-law and that if subsequently the statement given by him (Dubey) would be found to be incorrect the management would have the right to terminate the service of the concerned workman. On the strength of this declaration the concerned workman was taken in employment with effect from 18-10-77. Thereafter management got information that the concerned workman was not actually the son-in-law of Dubey and that his services were secured on a false declaration. Upon this information a very Senior Officer of the company was asked to hold a preliminary enquiry and it was found in that enquiry that the concerned workman had secured the job under the company under a false representation that he was the son-in-law of Dubey. After this finding in the preliminary enquiry a show cause notice was issued to the concerned workman calling upon him to show cause as to why his services would not be terminated he having secured his service on a false representation. The

concerned workman submitted a reply which was not found satisfactory by the management. Thereafter the management held a domestic enquiry in which the concerned workman was given full opportunity to cross-examine the management's witness and also to adduce evidence in support of his defence. The domestic enquiry was held after observing all the principles of natural justice. In the said enquiry the misconduct alleged against the concerned workman was satisfactorily established. Upon the findings in the domestic enquiry that the concerned workman was guilty of misconduct the management dismissed the concerned workman from service with effect from 24th May, 1978 by letter dated 19th/20th May, 1978 with approval of Manager (collieries). Securing a service by false declaration not only amounts to grave and serious misconduct but deprives other genuine dependents from securing employment. In this view the action of the management in terminating the services of the concerned workman cannot be said to be unjustified. On these grounds management prays that the reference should be answered in its favour.

As the union in its written statement had challenged the fairness of the domestic enquiry with the consent of both parties the question regarding fairness of the domestic enquiry was taken up for hearing as a preliminary issue before going into the merit of the case on 16th December, 1981. In course of hearing on the preliminary issue Mr. B. N. Sharma for the union conceded that he had no complaint regarding the procedural formalities observed in the domestic enquiry. He only said that the findings arrived at by the Enquiry Officer in the domestic enquiry were not justified by the evidence led in the enquiry. With this submission Mr. Sharma contended that if his right to challenge the correctness of the findings of the Enquiry Officer on the evidence recorded in the enquiry will be reserved to be exercised at the time of final hearing of the case he would have no objection if the Tribunal could hold the enquiry to be fair and proper. Mr. S. S. Mukherjee learned counsel for the company submitted that subject to Mr. Sharma's right to challenge the correctness of the findings in the domestic enquiry at the time of hearing of the case on merit the domestic enquiry may be held to be fair and proper. On this concession by both parties by order dated 16th December, 1981 the domestic enquiry was held to be fair and proper and the enquiry report, the evidence recorded in the enquiry, documents relied upon by the management in the enquiry, the charge sheet issued against the delinquent, his explanation to the charge and the impugned order of dismissal were accepted as evidence in the case as agreed to by the parties and those documents were marked as Exts. on the side of the management.

At the time of final hearing of the Case Mr. S. S. Mukherjee for the management and Mr. B. N. Sharma for the union argued their respective cases on the basis of the materials already on record.

The reference in this case is dated 28th February, 1981. The impugned order of dismissal of the concerned workman from service in the case has been passed on the basis of finding in the domestic enquiry that the workman secured employment under the company by deceitful means. The normal practice with the company which is not disputed before me, is that a workman after serving for 15 years can get the names of his dependents registered in a register maintained by the company so that when vacancy arises for post of Cat. I Mazdoor the dependents so registered may be considered for appointment. A dependant includes son, brother and son-in-law. The case of the union as per its pleadings is that the concerned workman being the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey got employment under the company as Cat. I Mazdoor as per the prevailing practice in the company and that the findings arrived at in the domestic enquiry to the effect that the concerned workman is not the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey is not correct. This case of the union will be examined while dealing with the evidence in the case. In the instant case Darbari Dubey an ex-workman who was reemployed on 13th June, 1975 made an application dated 28th November, 1976 Ext. M-14 for appointment of the concerned workman alleging that the latter was his (Darbari) son-in-law and he (Daibari) had no other issue. It also appears that the name of the concerned workman had been registered as a dependent of Darbari Dubey on 26th February, 1976. Upon the said application of Darbari Dubey the case of the concerned workman was considered for employment by the

management which accepting the representation made by Darbari Dubey appointed the concerned workman on 18th October, 1977 in Cat. I Mazdoor in Central Coal Washery. Before the concerned workman was appointed both the concerned workman as well as Darbari Dubey gave a joint declaration before the management Ext. M-15. As per this declaration both Darbari Dubey as well as the concerned workman have said that the company shall have the right to terminate the services of the concerned workman if it would be found later that the concerned workman is not the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey. This declaration has been signed both by Darbari Dubey and the concerned workman and is dated 16th September, 1977. As has been already stated that the concerned workman was appointed on 18th October, 1977 on the basis of his application Ext. M-14 and of declaration Ext. M-15. The case of the management is that after the concerned workman was appointed on 18th October, 1977 the management got an information that the concerned workman was not related to Darbari Dubey and that the former got an appointment by making a false representation. Upon this information the Divisional Manager of the company having asked the Chief Personnel Manager, Sri T. Prasad, to conduct a preliminary enquiry such an enquiry was conducted in course of which the statement of one Ram Bachan Tiwari was taken. After closure of the enquiry Sri T. Prasad submitted his report which showed that in course of the enquiry besides examining one Ram Bachan Tiwari and recording the statement of the concerned workman the enquiry officer had some discussion with one Devendra Singh. The enquiry was held on 10th January, 1978. The report of Sri T. Prasad was to the effect that the concerned workman got employment on false representation that he was son-in-law of Darbari Dubey an ex-employee of the company. So the management chargesheeted the concerned workman and called upon him to show cause as to why his services would not be terminated. The reply submitted by the concerned workman not being found satisfactory the management held a domestic enquiry. In the domestic enquiry the proceeding papers relating to the preliminary enquiry held by the Chief Personnel Manager Sri T. Prasad were filed and marked as Ext. M-1. The very same papers have been marked as Ext. M-18 before the Tribunal. In the domestic enquiry the Chief Personnel Manager who had held the preliminary enquiry was examined as a witness for the management. The report of the Chief Personnel Manager dated 12th January, 1978 to the Divisional Manager is Ext. M-2 before the Tribunal. On receipt of the report of the Chief Personnel Manager the Divn. Manager by letter dated 17th February, 1978 asked the Chief Engineer of the Washery to issue a chargesheet against the concerned workman. Accordingly a chargesheet dated 28th February, 1978/1st March, 1978 was issued to the workman. The chargesheet is Ext. M-3. Workman's reply dated 6th March, 1978 is Ext. M-4. As has been stated earlier the reply not having been found satisfactory the management held a domestic enquiry and notice for the enquiry dated 5th/6th April, 1978 was given to the workman. The notice shows that the enquiry was fixed to 10th April, 1978. Notice is Ext. M-5. The domestic enquiry papers reveal that on 10th April, 1978 the workman appeared, Sri T. Prasad, Chief Personnel Manager who had held preliminary enquiry was examined and that in course of the enquiry Sri T. Prasad produced the preliminary enquiry proceeding papers. Sri T. Prasad was not cross-examined by the workman who was present. The statement of Sri T. Prasad is Ext. M-9. After examination of Sri T. Prasad the domestic enquiry was adjourned to 14th April, 1978 which is evidenced from Ext. M-6 and M-7. Domestic enquiry continued on 14th April, 1978 when Rambachan Tewari who had been examined in the preliminary enquiry by Sri T. Prasad was examined as MW-2 in the domestic enquiry. This witness was also not cross-examined by the workman. The management after examining Rambachan Tewari closed its case whereafter the concerned workman gave his statement but did not adduce any evidence. The report of the domestic enquiry is Ext. M-10 dated 15th April, 1978 in which the Enquiry Officer found the workman guilty. MW-2 Rambachan Tewari examined in the domestic enquiry says that as he was threatened by the concerned workman and that as his life was in danger he could not give a correct statement regarding the relationship of the concerned workman with Darbari Dubey. The following passage from his evidence is quoted below.

"If I give correct statement my life is in danger. If I give incorrect (false) statement I remain disloyal to the management I have already given my statement earlier on this

issue, I do not mind if the management continues to keep Sri Ramanuj as its employee and dispense with my services as I do not want to give my statement out of fear. If I will be killed my family members will starve". The aforesaid statement of the witness clearly shows that being afraid of the concerned workman Rambachan Tewari did not repeat what he had said earlier before the Chief Personnel Manager in the preliminary enquiry. However the statement of this very witness in the preliminary enquiry produced before the domestic enquiry is now before the Tribunal and is marked Ext. M-8. This document shows that MW-2 Rambachan Tewari in the preliminary enquiry deposed as follows.

"He knew Darbari Dubey who is his own brother-in-law. Father of Darbari Dubey was Lal Bahadur Dubey. Lal Bahadur Dubey had three sons, namely, Parsutham Dubey, Parsidhan Dubey and Darbari Dubey. Parsutham Dubey was alive and his son Paras Dubey was working in Malkera Colliery as a miner. Parsudhan Dubey had expired while Darbari Dubey had two sons and one daughter. The sons were Shankar Dubey and Pappu. The daughter was Miss Guddi. Miss Guddi had not been married."

The aforesaid statement of Rambachan Tewari has not been given a go-by while he deposed in domestic enquiry. In the domestic enquiry he has clearly said that out of fear he was unable to repeat his earlier statement in the domestic enquiry. There is nothing to disbelieve the witness Rambachan Tewari. Even though Rambachan Tewari was examined in the domestic enquiry and his earlier statement in the preliminary enquiry was produced in the domestic enquiry the concerned workman did not choose to cross-examine Sri Tewari and made no attempt to show that Tewari's earlier statement was untrue. There is no reason why the earlier statement of Sri Tewari should not be accepted. The said statement clearly establishes that the concerned workman is not the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey. So the conclusion is that the concerned workman got himself appointed by deceitful means. The domestic enquiry proceeding shows that the concerned workman was all along present. If he really wanted to prove his case he could have examined Darbari Dubey whom he claims to be his own father-in-law and also his own wife to say that she was the daughter of Darbari Dubey. Not having adduced any evidence my conclusion is that the finding of the enquiry officer in the domestic enquiry to the effect that the concerned workman is not the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey and that he (workman) got an appointment for himself under the company by making a false representation have to be accepted. Such being the conclusion the case of the union that the concerned workman being the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey cannot be said to have been appointed by deceitful means is wholly unacceptable. I therefore hold that by making a false representation to the company to the effect that the workman was a son-in-law of Darbari Dubey, the ex-workman, the workman concerned got himself appointed as Cat. I Mazdoor and thereafter continued to work in that capacity under the company till the fraud committed by him was detected.

The next question is whether the management is justified in dismissing the concerned workman on a finding that he is guilty of misconduct under certified Standing Orders applicable to the company. Clause 19 of the certified Standing Orders enumerates different kinds of misconduct of which a workman can be held guilty. Clause 19(2) says that theft, fraud or dishonesty in connection with company's business or property is a misconduct. In the present case the workman by taking recourse to dishonesty got himself appointed in the company's business. Therefore such an act of the workman will amount to a misconduct as given in Clause 19(2). According to Mr. Mukherjee learned counsel for the company. But it is well established that misconduct of which a workman is found guilty must be a misconduct after his employment. In other words a workman who had committed theft or fraud or any dishonest act in connection with company's business or property before his appointment under the company cannot be dismissed from service on account of such act of theft, fraud or dishonesty. To put it in another way the misconduct of which a workman is found guilty under the Standing Orders must be a misconduct during the course of his employment. In the present case the fraud or dishonesty which is alleged to have been committed by the workman was before his appointment under the company and on the eve of his appointment. So far as such an act of the workman is concerned the company cannot hold him guilty under the certified Standing Orders and dismiss him.

To meet this it is rightly contended by Mukherjee that the misrepresentation or fraud that was committed by the workman before he was appointed continued after his appointment and so the workman could be found guilty under the Standing Orders of the company for the act of misconduct which continued after his employment. This contention is well founded. Certainly when the workman misrepresented before the company that he was the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey in order to secure his appointment he committed a wrong. But this wrong continued after his appointment because each day he worked under the company after his appointment he must be deemed to be misrepresenting to the company that he is the son-in-law of Darbari Dubey and the company must be deemed to have allowed the workman to work by believing the wrong representation. This conduct of the workman after his appointment does amount to fraud and dishonesty in connection with company's business, and so the management is right in chargesheeting the workman for such misconduct, in holding domestic enquiry and in dismissing the workman on the finding in the domestic enquiry that he is guilty. That apart Clause 19(19) of Standing Orders also says that any breach of any Act also amounts to misconduct. The workman by making false representation to the company saying that he is the son-in-law of the ex-workman Darbari Dubey in course of his employment and by making the company believe such false representation must be held to have cheated the company which is an offence under Indian Penal Code for which he is liable to conviction. Such being the position the act of the concerned workman also amounts to a misconduct under Cl. 19(19) of certified Standing Orders. In the domestic enquiry the workman has been found guilty on the evidence of Rambachan Tewari recorded in the preliminary enquiry which was before the Enquiry Officer in the domestic enquiry. I have referred to this evidence of Rambachan Tewari earlier. I have also referred to the evidence of Rambachan Tewari when he was examined as MW-2 in the domestic enquiry. On the basis of all I have already held that the Enquiry Officer is fully justified in holding the concerned workman guilty of the misconduct charged against him. The chargesheet issued against the concerned workman contains the allegations in detail against him. That being so it cannot be said that the concerned workman was prejudiced because the chargesheet does not mention the particular provision in the certified Standing Orders under which he is charged. Clause 20 of the certified Standing Orders say that the order of punishment of dismissal can be passed after approval of the Divn. Manager. In the present case the Chief Engineer (Washery) submitted the domestic enquiry report Ext M-10. The letter of the Chief Engineer is Ext. M-11. The Divn. Manager by his letter dated 15th/18th May, 1978, Ext. M-12 approved the recommendation of the Chief Engineer. Thereafter letter of dismissal signed by the Chief Engineer dated 19th/20th May, 1978 dismissing the concerned workman with effect from 24th May, 1978 was issued. Thus the provisions of the certified Standing Orders have been followed in passing the impugned order of dismissal and there appears to be no defect in it. No other point is argued before me.

For the reasons stated above I hold that the action of the management dismissing the concerned workman from service by the impugned order of dismissal is justified and the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered accordingly. In the circumstances there will be no order for costs.

[No. L-20012(299)/80-D.III(A)]

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer

S.O. 1314.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. I, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of
I.D. Act, 1947.

Reference No. 37 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Ltd, Post Office Jeenagora, Dist. Dhanbad

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. K. Chatterjee, Advocate, with Shri R. R. Bhattacharjee, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, dated the 4th March, 1982

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/73/81-D.III(A) dated the 2nd July, 1981, the Central Government being of opinion that an industrial dispute existed between the employers in relation to the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule attached to the order, referred the same for adjudication to this Tribunal.

The schedule attached to the order reads thus.

"Whether the action of the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Area No. X of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad in superannuating Shri Dilawar Mian, Explosive Carrier from service with effect from the 24th January, 1980 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After notice to the parties they have filed their respective written statements and rejoinders.

3. The case of the employers as per their pleading is as follows. The reference is not legally maintainable. The concerned workman was working as Explosive Carrier at Joyrampur Colliery. He was a permanent workman and also a member of Coal Mines Provident Fund. As per the declaration given by him at the time he became the member of the Coal Mines Provident Fund his date of birth was 15-4-1920. The management thereafter prepared the identity card register in the year 1973. After entries in the said register were made the concerned workman in token of his acceptance of correctness of the entries authenticated the same by putting his L.T.I. against the entries. As per this register the date of birth of the concerned workman was noted to be 15-4-1920. According to the entry in the identity card register an identity card was issued to the concerned workman containing the details of the entries in the register. Thereafter neither the workman nor anybody on his behalf raised any dispute regarding the date of his birth recorded either in the CMPF register or in the identity card register or in the identity card itself. So the management accepted the date of birth of the workman to be 15-4-1920. According to the entry regarding his date of birth noted both in the CMPF register as well as in the identity card register the concerned workman after completing his 60th year was superannuated by the management with effect from 16-4-1980. After retirement the workman in order to make an illegal gain raised a dispute on the plea that the date of birth as recorded both in CMPF register as well as in the identity card register was not correct. There being no substance in the dispute raised by the workman and there being nothing to show that the records

of the management showing that the date of birth of the concerned workman is wrong the action of the management in superannuating the concerned workman as stated earlier is legal, bona fide and justified. If it will appear that in the Form A submitted by the workman in CMF office his date of birth is 15-4-1926 as contended then it must follow that the digit 'O' in Form A has been surreptitiously changed to digit '6' by manipulating entries in Form A.

4. The case of the union as per its pleading is as follows. The workman was initially appointed as a miner and subsequently he became an explosive carrier from 1974 in Joyrampur Colliery. He is a member of CMF scheme and as per rules he filled up Form A to be filed in the CMF office. In that form the date of birth of the workman was given as 15-4-26. The entries in the Form were authenticated by the workman by putting his thumb mark thereon and they were also verified by the manager of the colliery. The date of birth of the workman being 15-4-26 could not have been retired with effect from 16-4-80. The records maintained by the management showing the date of birth of the concerned as 15-4-20 are wrong. The workman on knowing the wrong entry regarding his date of birth in company's records wrote several letters to the management to rectify the mistake. The management in spite of the letters kept quite without rectifying the mistake. In this view the notice issued by the management on 24-1-80 saying that the workman is to retire with effect from 16-4-80 is illegal, wrong and contrary to the actual state of affairs.

5. At the time of hearing it was pointed out by Mr. Joshi learned counsel for the management that the language of the reference saying as to whether the action of the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Area No. X of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Jeenagaon, Dist Dhanbad in superannuating Shi Dilawar Mian, Explosive Carrier from service with effect from the 24th January, 1980 is justified does not represent correct state of things in as much as the workman was retired not with effect from 24-1-80 but with effect from 16-4-80. It is concerned by Mr. Joshi that retirement notice was given to the workman on 24-1-80 saying that he was to retire on 16-4-80. Therefore the proper language of the reference should have been whether the action of the management in superannuating the concerned workman from 16-4-80 is justified. While submitting this Mr. Joshi concedes that the mistake in the order of reference is of clerical nature which is apparent also from the pleading of the union in which it has been specifically mentioned that the workman was retired with effect from 16-4-80 after service of notice on 24-1-80. This position is also accepted on behalf of the union. So according to both parties the mistake in the language of reference should not be taken to be a total one and reference should be answered on the footing as to whether the action of the management in retiring the concerned workman from 16-4-80 is justified. The concession made by the parties is justified and I therefore hold that the reference to be answered is as to whether the action of the management in giving notice to the concerned workman on 24-1-80 asking him to retire with effect from 16-4-80 and retiring him with effect from 16-4-80 is justified.

At the time of hearing the management besides examining Sri A. C. Karmakar, Asstt. Manager of Joyrampur Colliery as MW-1 has proved two entries Lats. M-1 and M-5 in Provident Fund Register and in the Identity Card Register respectively maintained by the company regarding the date of birth of the concerned workman on the side of the union the concerned workman has only been examined in support of his case. At this stage it will not be out of place to mention here that the union had called for Form A of the concerned workman from CMF office. The CMF office in reply has said that the said form is not available.

MW-1 asserts that the company maintains a Provident Fund Register for Joyrampur Colliery. The entry relating to the concerned workman has been written by one Janakdeo who died subsequently. This entry is marked Ext. M-1. According to the witness the entry Ext. M-1 which shows the date of birth of the concerned workman to be 15-4-20 has been made as per declaration of the workman himself. The practice as deposed by the witness with the company

is that when a workman joins the colliery his name is entered in the register of P.F. Fund and all the columns in the register are filled up as per the declaration of the workman except the column for P.F. Account and that when the workman becomes a member of Provident Fund his account number is filled up in the column reserved for it. The entries so made in the P.F. Register the witness asserts are copied in Form A which is signed or thumb marked by the workman before the same is sent to CMF office. MW-1 further says that the company also maintains an Identity Card Register for its workmen and he proves Ext. M-5 the entry in the said register in respect of the concerned workman. This entry according to the witness is made according to declaration of the workman. The concerned workman in the present case, the witness deposes, has put his L.T.I. against the entries as a token of his acceptance of their correctness. According to this entry the date of birth of the concerned workman is 15-4-20. MW-1 also goes on to say that Identity Card was issued to the concerned workman according to entries made in the Identity Card Register. The witness is very specific in his statement that at the time when the entries in the Identity Card Register were made he was deputed by the Manager to identify the concerned workman. The witness also says that he saw the concerned workman putting his thumb mark in the concerned register. MW-1 also proves the entries in the Form B maintained by the company in respect of the concerned workman and also proves the thumb mark of the workman against the entry in his name. The Col. for age in Form B Register is found to be blank. MW-1 says that as at that time the workman did not declare his age the Col. was left blank. The witness however admits in cross-examination so far as entries in P.F. Register are concerned that they were not made in his presence but the witness says that the register is maintained by the company in ordinary course of business. According to him this register is only maintained to facilitate filling up Form A for the workmen when they become eligible for membership in the Provident Fund Scheme. The workman on the other hand as WW-1 says that Form A was filled up by a clerk of the colliery whose name he does not know. The clerk who filled up the form after getting the workman's thumb mark thereon got it signed by the manager. Thereafter the clerk sent it to the P.F. Office. At the time of filling up the Form B Register the workman admits in cross-examination that he did not give his date of birth as 15-4-26. This supports the evidence of MW-1. The witness asserts that at the time of filling up the Identity Card register he gave his date of birth as 15-4-26. At the same time the witness admits his thumb mark against the entry in respect of him in the Identity Card register. The workman also admits in his evidence that as per entries in Identity Card Register an Identity Card was issued to him. After getting the card the workman as per his evidence says that he did not try to know the contents of the entry in the Identity Card after the same was delivered to him. He only came to know the wrong entry in the Identity Card after he received notice for superannuation. WW-1 also admits that at the time of filling up P.F. register he declared his age. This evidence also corroborates the evidence of MW-1. This is all the evidence led by the parties. So far as the company's records are concerned, namely, P.F. Register and the Identity Card Register both of them show that the date of birth of the workman is 15-4-20. It is also admitted by the workman that as per the entry in the Identity Card Register he himself got his identity card which was in the year 1973. He received the notice for superannuation on 24-1-80. It is curious that from the day he received the Identity Card till the date he received the notice of superannuation he did not care to ascertain if the entry regarding the date of birth given in his identity card which was all along with him was correct. He only came to know that the entry regarding his date of birth in the identity card was wrong when he received notice for superannuation. It is very difficult to accept such a plea. Even though it is asserted in the pleading of the union that after wrong entry regarding date of birth of the concerned workman was known to him he made several representations to the management for correction, no attempt has been made by the union to prove this plea. Admittedly Form A which was sent to the CMF contains a declaration of the date of birth of the concerned workman. The form although called for from CMF office could not be produced as office said that it was not available. In the absence of the Form the workman only asserts that the date of birth mentioned in the said form is 15-4-26. This

evidence of the workman is not corroborated by any other witness and it is very difficult to accept the most interested and uncorroborated testimony of the workman. MW-1 a responsible officer of the company has emphatically said in his deposition that at the time the entries in the Identity Card Register regarding the concerned workman were made he was himself deputed by the manager for identification of the workman. MW-1 says that in his presence the workman disclosed his date of birth to be 16-4-20. The workman himself admits his thumb mark against his entry. The case of the union is that this wrong entry regarding the age of the workman also found place in the Identity Card issued to the workman. I have already said that even though the card was issued in the year 1973 no step worth the name was taken for correction of the mistake. Nothing has been shown as to why MW-1 would come to support a false case for the management. Mr. S. K. Chatterjee for the union invites my attention to para 4 of the rejoinder filed by the company where it has been stated that in case it is found from Form A submitted in the P.F. Office that the age of the concerned workman is 15-4-26 it must be taken that digit '0' has been subsequently converted digit '6'. On the basis of this averment in the rejoinder Mr. Chatterjee argues that it must be taken for granted that in Form A the age of the concerned workman is given to be 15-4-26 and so when the management comes forward with a case of fraud and manipulation of the said entry regarding the age, the onus is upon the management to prove such a case. Management not having proved the case it must be held that as admitted by the management the date of birth of the concerned workman given in Form A is 15-4-26. For this contention he invites my attention to Sec. 102 of the Evidence Act where it is said that burden of proof in a suit lies on that person who would fail if no evidence at all is given on either side. This contention of Mr. Chatterjee is without any substance. There is no admission by the management in para 4 of its rejoinder that the date of birth of concerned workman as given in Form A is 15-4-26. Had there been such an admission in that event only management having failed to establish a case of subsequent manipulation would have been held bound by its own admission that the date of birth as given in Form A is 15-4-26. I have already pointed out that there is no such admission in para 4 of the rejoinder of the management. The management has proved its own registers regarding the date of birth of the concerned workman. These registers have been maintained in usual course of business. So far as the entries in the Identity Card Register is concerned MW-1 clearly says that as per the declaration given by the concerned workman his date of birth has been recorded. The story told by the workman that after he received Identity Card he never questioned about correctness of the date of birth given therein till he received notice for superannuation cannot be accepted. The solitary statement of the concerned workman that the date of birth given in Form A is 15-4-26 is not possible to accept without corroboration. The conduct of the workman in keeping silence after having received identity card in 1973 till he received notice for superannuation on 24-1-80 is also another strong circumstance against the union's case. Over and above this MW-1 admits that he declared his age at the time of P.F. Register was filled up by the management. The entry relating to the workman in P.F. Register has been proved by MW-1 and this entry shows that the date of birth of the workman is 15-4-20.

For the reasons given above I hold that the date of birth of the concerned workman as given in the Provident Fund Register as well as Identity Card Register is as per the declaration of the concerned workman and is correct. The story of the union that the date of birth of the workman is 15-4-26 and that the said date has been mentioned in Form A is wholly unacceptable not being supported by any reliable evidence. In the result, therefore, I have no doubt in my mind that the action of the management in giving notice to the concerned workman on 24-1-80 to superannuate him with effect from 16-4-80 and in superannuating him on that date is fully justified and the workman is not entitled to any relief at all. In the circumstances there will be no order for costs.

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(73)/81-D III(A)]

S.O. 1315.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th March, 1982.

BEFORE MR. JUSTICE B. K. RAY (RETD.)—PRESIDING OFFICER, THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of
I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 47 of 1981

[Ministry's Order No. I-20012 (152)/81D.III(A), Dt. 19-8-81]

PRESENT :

Employers in relation to the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri B. N. Sharma, Secretary, Janta Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 6th March, 1982

AWARD

The reference in this case is about justification of the action of the management of Joyrampur Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad in retiring Shri Raghubir Saw, Surface Trammer from service with effect from 16-4-1980. Shri Raghubir Saw the concerned workman according to the management completed his 60th year on 16-4-80 his date of birth being 15-4-20 and so he was rightly retired on 16-4-80. His date of birth finds mention in C.M.P.F. Register as well as in Identity Card Register maintained by the management. MW-1 the witness for the management proves the entry relating to the concerned workman in the Identity Card Register of the management. This entry has been thumb marked by the concerned workman and there is a photograph of him by the side of the entry. MW-1 says that at the time when this register was filled up he being deputed by the manager of the colliery identified the concerned workman in whose presence and as per whose declaration the entries were filled up. The witness further says that before the concerned workman was asked to put his thumb mark against the entry the same was explained to him who having admitted the correctness thereof put his thumb mark in the register against the entry. Ext. M 6 is the relevant entry in the Identity Card Register. MW-1 has also proved an entry in the P.F. Register maintained by the company regarding the concerned workman. The entries in this register according to MW-1 are filled up as per the declaration of the workmen concerned. But the witness himself does not say that the entry in the P.F. Register regarding the concerned workman in the present case was actually filled up in the presence of the workman and as per his declaration. The witness only deposes about the prevalent practice followed in filling up P.F. Register and asserts that this register is maintained in usual course of business. The entry in this register regarding the workman is Ext. M-2. Both these entries, namely, Ext. M-2 and M-6 show that the date of birth of the concerned workman is 15-4-20. The writer of these entries according to MW-1 is dead. It is the case of the management that after an entry in the Identity Card register was made as per the declaration of the concerned workman and after he put thumb mark as a token of his acceptance of the correctness of the entry in the register in Identity Card was issued to him MW-2 another

witness for the management has proved the identity card produced by the union which according to the management was issued to the concerned workman after the entry in the Identity Card register was made. The Identity Card has been marked as Ext. W-1. MW-2 says that the entries in the Identity Card are in the handwriting of Ram Ekwal Singh who was the clerk of the Personnel Department then and is now Executive Member of Janata Mazdoor Sangh. The date of birth given in the Identity Card is 15-4-40. Thus this date of birth does not tally with the date of birth as given in the Identity Card Register as well as in the Provident Fund Register. The witness MW-2 says that the entries about the workman's date of birth in the P.F. Register and Identity Card Register are correct whereas the entry regarding date of birth in the identity card is incorrect and is the result of an act of manipulation by somebody. The witness however admits that the Identity Card Ext. W-1 contains the signature of R. A. Singh, who was the Personnel Officer at the time the Card was issued. The workman in the case has not examined himself to contradict the evidence of MW-1 who has proved the entries regarding his date of birth in the Provident Fund Register and in the Identity Card Register and has said that in his presence the entry in the Identity Card Register was written as per the declaration of the concerned workman who after understanding the contents of the entry put his thumb mark in the register. The evidence of MW-1 therefore stands unchallenged. MW-2 of course gives an opinion that the entry in the Identity Card is incorrect and is the result of an act of manipulation by somebody. This being his opinion it is urged on behalf of the union that the said opinion cannot be accepted without examining R. A. Singh, the signatory of the Identity Card. This contention would have carried weight had there been some evidence adduced by the union contradicting the evidence of MW-1 who has proved the entries in the Provident Fund register and the Identity Card Register. In the absence of any evidence for the union even if the opinion expressed by MW-2 regarding the incorrect entries made in the Identity Card is not accepted still then on the basis of evidence of MW-1 it has to be held that the entries regarding the date of birth in the provident fund register and the identity card register were made as per the declaration of the concerned workman. It is nobody's case that the entry in the Identity card were made as per the declaration of the concerned workman. Admittedly entries in the identity card are only copied from the entries in the identity card register. When the identity card register shows that the date of birth of the concerned workman is 15-4-20 the correctness of which has been accepted there being no challenge to the evidence of MW-1 it must necessarily follow that the entry in the identity card regarding the age of the workman is a mistake as it does not tally with the entry in the identity card register. So far as the Form B register is concerned the column for recording the age is found to be blank. It is the case of the management that at the time when the concerned workman was originally appointed in the colliery the said colliery was under private management. So at that time private management while filling up Form B should have mentioned the age of the concerned workman after ascertaining the same from him. That obviously was not done. So after the colliery was nationalised in the Form B prepared after nationalisation the column for age was left blank as was the case in the old form. Form A is a statutory form and contains the declaration of the workman of his date of birth and has been submitted in the C.M.P.I. This has not been called for by the union. Had it been produced that would have thrown some light on the controversial point regarding the date of birth. Management on the basis of the documents maintained by it has proved satisfactorily that the date of birth of the concerned workman is 15-4-20 as per its own records and as per the declaration given by the workman. The management thus has discharged the initial onus that was upon it and the moment that initial onus was discharged by the management the onus to disprove the case of the management fell upon the union. The union has signally failed to discharge the onus. It has neither examined the concerned workman nor has placed any document of unimpeachable character to show that the entries regarding the date of birth in the registers maintained by the management are incorrect. At the cost of repetition I may again say that the identity card Ext. W-1 produced by the union not being an original record but being merely a copy of the entry in the identity card register it cannot prevail over the entries in the identity card register.

For the reasons given above I hold that the date of birth of the concerned workman is 15-4-20 and hence the action

of the management in superannuating the concerned workman with effect from 16-4-80 is justified. The reference is answered accordingly. There will be no order for costs.

[No. I-20012/152/81-D.III(A)]

B. K. Ray, Presiding Officer.

S.O. 1316.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. I, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of
I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 50 of 1981

(Ministry's Order No. I-20012/167/81-D.III.A, dt. 25-8-81)

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Joyrampur Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jeenagora, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Retd.)—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri B. N. Sharma, Secretary, Janta Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 8th March, 1982

AWARD

The challenge in this case is to the action of the management in superannuating the two concerned workmen with effect from 31-7-1980. According to the case of the union representing the workmen they had not reached the age of superannuation by 31-7-80, their age on 19-1-59 being 30 years each as per the boiler's certificates issued in their favour. Therefore it is said that the two workmen have been prematurely retired and hence the action of the management retiring them is not justified. Form B Register a statutory document maintained by the company according to the case both of the management as well as of the union does not give the correct age of the two workmen. According to the age of the two workmen as given in Form B Register Exts. M-11 and M-12 their age on the date of superannuation i.e. 31-7-80 would be 80 years each. There is no material to show on what basis the age of the two concerned workmen was recorded in the Form B Register and on what day the entries regarding their age were made. On account of these facts as has been pointed out earlier neither party relies upon the entries in Form B Register. Management, however, to justify its stand has come forward with two other registers, namely, identity card register and P.F. Register maintained by the company. Entries Exts. M-7 and M-8 in the identity card register produced by the management show that the date of birth of each of the two concerned workmen is 31-7-20. The entry in this register has been proved by MW-1 who is the Asstt. Manager of Joyrampur Colliery in which the two concerned workmen were working. The witness says that at the time of making the entries in respect of the two concerned workmen in the identity card register he was sent by the manager of the colliery to identify the two concerned workmen. The witness also says that the entries in the identity card register were made as per the declaration of the two concerned workmen, that after the entries were made they were explained to the two concerned workmen who were present and that they after accepting the correctness of the

entries in the register put their thumb marks against the entries. Although MW-1 was cross examined by union at length the evidence to the above effect has remained unshaken. Even one of the two concerned workmen who has been examined in this case has not denied the assertion made by MW-1 as stated above. In this view, therefore, I would accept the evidence of MW-1 to the effect that on the declaration of the two concerned workmen the date of each one of them has been recorded as 31-7-20 in the identity card register maintained by the management. The next relevant document on which the management relies is Provident Fund Register maintained by it. According to the evidence of MW-1 who has proved this document as soon as a workman is appointed under the management his name is entered in the register and against his name are entered other particulars such as date of birth etc. There is a column in this register for noting the provident fund account number of the workman. This column according to the witness is filled up after the workman becomes a member of the provident fund scheme and an account number is given to him. The witness also asserts that the entries in this register are also made as per the declaration of the workman concerned, and that at the time when the workman becomes eligible to be a member of provident fund scheme the entries relating to him in this register are copied in Form A signed or thumb marked by the workman, attested by an officer of the management and then the said form is sent to the provident fund office where a number is given to the workman. In other words according to the evidence of MW-1 the entries in the Form A a statutory form are only copies of the entries made in the provident fund register maintained by the company. This evidence also of MW-1 has not been shaken in cross-examination. There being no evidence contrary to the evidence of MW-1 I rely upon the same and hold on the basis of the entries in the provident fund register relating to the concerned workmen marked Exts. M-3 and M-4 that the age of each of the two concerned workmen as given in this register is 31-7-20 and that the entries regarding date of birth were given on the declaration of the two concerned workmen. To contradict entries Exts. M-3 and M-4 the union for reasons best known to it has not produced the Form A from the Provident Fund A from the Provident Fund office in respect of each of the two workmen. The union for its case only relies upon two boiler certificates granted to the two concerned workmen, namely, Exts. W-2 and W-3 where on 19-1-59 the age of each of the two concerned workmen has been mentioned to be about 30 years. MW-1 who has been examined in this case has clearly admitted that age as mentioned in the two certificates is not according to the declarations of the two concerned workmen. According to the witness the authority granting the certificate only assessed the age of the two concerned workmen from their appearance and noted the same in the certificates. Such being the position the entries in the two certificates Exts. W-2 and W-3 cannot be given preference over the entries in the Identity Card Register Exts. M-7 and M-8 and entries in the Provident Fund Register Exts. M-3 and M-4 giving the date of birth of the two concerned workmen, specially in view of the evidence of MW-1 that as per the declarations of the two concerned workmen their dates of birth were recorded in these entries. On analysis of the entries evidence led by the parties, therefore, I have no hesitation in my mind that the date of birth of each of the two concerned workmen as given according to their declaration is the two registers of the company, namely, Identity Card Register and Provident Fund Register, is 31-7-20. Thus 31-7-20 being the date of birth of each of the two concerned workmen as per their own declaration the same has to be accepted and the management has rightly retired them with effect from 31-7-80, in the absence of any evidence worth the name led by the union to the contrary.

For the reasons stated above I, therefore, hold that the action of the management in retiring the two concerned workmen with effect from 31-7-1980 is justified and the two concerned workmen are not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered accordingly. There will be no order for costs.

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(167)/81-D.III(A)]

New Delhi, the 17th March, 1982

S.O. 1317.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial

dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (South) Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Bhowra District, Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of I.D. Act

Reference No. 29 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (South) Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Retd.)—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri J. D. Lal, Secretary, Bihar Colliery Kamgar Union.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 12th March, 1982

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(52)/81-D.III.A, dated 2-6-1981, the Central Government being of opinion that an industrial dispute existed between the employers in relation to the management of Bhowra (South) Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule attached to the order, referred the same for adjudication to this Tribunal.

The schedule to the order reads thus :

"Whether the demand of the workman of Bhowra (South) Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad, that Shri Tukan Sao, Miner should be given light surface duty due to disability suffered by him in his right hand index finger arising out of an accident while on duty on the 6th December, 1977, is justified? If so, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. After notice to the parties they have filed their respective written statements and rejoinders.

It is not necessary to give in details the cases of the respective parties as pleaded in their pleadings because while the hearing of the case was going on parties entered into a written settlement outside the court settling the dispute referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. Required number of copies duly signed by the parties and their respective representatives were filed with a prayer that an award be passed in terms of the settlement. On 9-3-82 when the case was taken up for hearing in view of the settlement filed by the parties an order was passed accepting the prayer of the parties to pass an award in terms of the settlement and holding that the terms of the settlement were fair and reasonable. In view of this an award is passed as follows.

The management will provide employment with effect from 11-3-1982 to the concerned workman Sri Tukan Sao as a daily-rated worker in Cat. I in N.C.W.A. II pay scale of Rs. 15.00-0.26-18.12 on the minimum of the pay scale of that category i.e. Rs. 15 per day. Sri Tukan Sao will be required to perform the duties of Stone Dusting Mazdoor or of Lamp Mazdoor or of Shale Picker or of Ash Cleaning Mazdoor as may be required by the management either in the underground sections of the mine or on the surface from time to time. He will not be entitled to any pay protection of piece-rate of wages as applicable to him earlier when he was working as a piece-rated worker. He will not be entitled to any back wages for the period from 6-12-1977 to the date of his employment as Cat. I worker in terms of the agreement or to any other benefit in respect of that period except lump sum compensation under W.C. Act for loss of 5 per cent earning capacity. He will be allowed continuity

of service with reference to his past service, but for the purposes of continuous service as defined in Section 2(c) of Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972, the period from 6-12-1977 to the date of his employment as Cat. I worker in terms of the agreement will not be counted. The settlement arrived at between the parties settles the dispute under his reference. The agreement arrived at between the parties will not be relied upon by the workman as a precedent for justifying another case. The reference is thus answered. The parties are to bear their own costs. The settlement shall form part of the award.

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer
[No. L-20012(52)/81-D.III(A)]

PART OF THE AWARD

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD
In the matter of Ref. No. 29 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the Management of Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Bhowra (S) Colliery, P. O. Bhowra, Dist. Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

The above mentioned employers and workman most respectfully beg to submit that they have mutually discussed the matter and have come to a negotiated overall settlement in respect of the above matter on the following terms :—

- (1) That the Management will provide employment w.e.f. 11-3-82 to the workman concerned, viz. Sri Tukan Sao, as a daily-rated worker in Cat. I in the N.C.W.A. II pay scale of Rs. 15.00—0.26—18.12 on the minimum of the pay scale of that category, i.e. Rs. 15 per day and Sri Tukan Sao will be required to perform the duties of Stone Dusting Mazdoor, or Lamp Mazdoor Shale Picker or Ash Cleaning Mazdoor as he may be required to perform by the Management either in the underground sections of the mine or on the surface from time to time. He will not be entitled to any protection of piece-rates of wages as applicable to him earlier when he was working as a piece-rated worker.
- (2) That the workman concerned, Sri Tukan Sao will not be entitled to any back wages for the period from 6-12-1977 to the date of his employment as Cat. I worker in terms of this agreement or to any other benefit in respect of that period, except lump sum compensation under W.C. Act for loss of 5 per cent earning capacity.
- (3) That the workman concerned, Sri Tukan Sao will be allowed continuity of service with reference to his past service but for the purposes of 'Continuous service' as defined in Sec. 2(c) of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972, the period from 6-12-1977 to the date of his employment as Cat. I worker in terms of this agreement will not be counted.
- (4) That this is an overall agreement in connection with all the claims of Sri Tukan Sao in connection with the aforesaid matter/refernce
- (5) That this agreement will not be quoted or cited by the workmen as a precedent for justifying or canvassing any other case.
- (6) That both the parties agree to all the terms and conditions set out in this agreement and they feel that this is a fair, just and reasonable settlement of the entire matter covered by the present reference.

In view of the above, both the employers and workmen pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to give an award in terms of this agreement.

Sd/-

(J.D. LALL)

Secretary, Bihar Colliery
Kamgar Union,
For and on behalf of workmen.

Sd/-

(Y. P. OHRI)

Superintendent/Agent,
Bhodra South Colliery,
B.C.C.L.

(TUKAN SAU)

Workman concerned.

Sd/-

(RAL. S. MURTHY)

Advocate,
For Employers.
Dhanbad, 9th March, 1982.

S.O. 1318.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Saraidhela, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th March, 1982.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD.

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of I. D. Act, 1947.

Reference No. 32 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Saraidhela, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice B. K. Ray (Rtd.)

Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers : Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workman : Shri R. Prasad, General Secretary, Bharat Coking Coal Staff Co-ordination, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 11th March, 1982.

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(54)/81-D. III(A) dated the 10th June, 1981, the Central Government being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P. O. Saraidhela, Dist. Dhanbad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule attached to the order referred the same for adjudication to this Tribunal. The schedule to the order reads thus.

"Whether the demand of the workman of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Saraidhela, District Dhanbad that Shri C. D. Bhattacherjee, Assistant, Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Koyal Bhanwan, Dhanbad should be given benefit of promotion from Clerical Grade-II to Grade-I from December,

1975 when his juniors were promoted is justified? If so, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. After notice to the parties they have filed their respective written statements and rejoinders.

The case of the union as made out in its pleading may be briefly stated thus. The concerned workman was appointed in Clerk Gr. II on 14-7-66 and has been working to the full satisfaction of his superiors under whom he has been placed. On account of satisfactory nature of his work the controlling officer recommended his case for promotion to the next higher grade and on 21-6-73 in response to the recommendation the Senior Industrial Relation Officer by letter dated 9/10-8-73 sought some clarification regarding the workman. Clarification was accordingly sent by the controlling officer on 12-12-73. Inspite of this the management at that time did not consider the concerned workman for promotion to the next higher grade. Thereafter the management constituted a D.P.C. on 8-12-75 for promotion of existing clerks from Gr. II to Gr. I. That D.P.C. did not recommend the case of the concerned workman for promotion although it recommended many juniors to the workman for promotion. The management by not promoting the concerned workman did injustice to him. So the sponsoring union took up the case of the concerned workman and raised the present dispute which has been ultimately referred by the Central Govt. to this Tribunal. The action of the management in not promoting the concerned workman from Gr. II to Gr. I is nothing but is an instance of unfair labour practice. In these circumstances the union claims that the concerned workman should be promoted from Gr. II to Gr. I with effect from 30-12-75 and his seniority should be fixed accordingly.

The case of the management is as follows. The concerned workman having never made any demand in respect of the dispute under reference before the management there cannot be any industrial dispute in the eye of law. Hence the Central Government has no jurisdiction to refer the matter for adjudication to his Tribunal. Prior to 29-6-77 the concerned workman was working as Gr. II Clerk. In December 1975 the D.P.C. constituted by the management considered the case of the concerned workman alongwith the cases of other clerks in Gr. II for promotion to Gr. I. On the basis of criteria laid down by the management the D.P.C. did not recommend the concerned workman for promotion as he was not found suitable on evaluation of his past performance. The recommendation of D.P.C. was approved by competent authority of the management. Therefore the workman concerned was not promoted and on that account he could not have any grievance. Thereafter when again vacancy in Gr. I arose in 1977 the case of the concerned workman was considered by D.P.C. constituted by the management. The D.P.C. on the second occasion found the concerned workman suitable for promotion and so recommended his case. The recommendation of the D.P.C. was approved by competent authority of the management and thereafter the workman concerned was promoted to the post of Clerk Gr. I with effect from 21-6-77. Promotion of a clerk from Gr. II to Gr. I is not based only on seniority and it is not correct to say that in the case of the seniormost clerk in Gr. II the promotion is automatic. Seniority is only one of the considerations which is taken into account at the time of deciding a case of promotion. Management being only competent to say on the basis of performance of an employee if he is fit for promotion to the next higher grade the judgement of the management in such a case cannot be substituted by a judgement of a Court or Tribunal. To promote an employee from one grade to another is the sole function of the management and no authority except the management is competent to discharge the said function. On these allegations the company submits that the reference be answered against the union.

3. At the time of hearing parties did not choose to adduce any oral evidence. They only relied upon certain items of document which were marked on admission as exhibits formal proof of the same being waived. In this way as many as five documents, namely, Ext. W-1 to W-5 were marked on the side of the management two documents, namely, Exts. M-1 to M-2 were marked as exhibits. Parties have been heard at length in support of their respective cases with reference to the documents relied upon by them. The order of the reference shows that the demand in the

present case is for promotion of the concerned workman from Clerk Gr. II to Clerk Gr. I with effect from December, 1975 on the ground that his juniors have been promoted from that time. The language used in the order of reference indicates as if seniority is the only consideration which has to be taken into account in deciding a case of promotion. It is not disputed that at the time when the juniors of the concerned workman were promoted the company had not framed its promotion policy. The management framed its promotion policy on 20-6-77. Ext. W-1 relied upon by the union is the said promotion policy of the company. Under para 6-1 of Ext. W-1 it is provided that for purpose of promotion from Gr. II to Gr. I employees will be promoted on the basis of seniority as the main criteria subject to their satisfactory performance. On the basis of this it is argued on behalf of the union that seniority being the main criteria and there being nothing to show that the concerned workman's performance prior to December, 1975 was not satisfactory the management's action in not promoting the workman while promoting his juniors in contrary to this policy as laid down in Ext. W-1. Regarding satisfactory performance union refers to me para 11.1 of Ext. W-1 which says that performance appraise reports shall be obtained in the proforma enclosed in Annexure D and the guide lines for filling up proforma are mentioned in the proforma itself. The proforma mentioned in para 11.1 in Ext. W-1 has been separately marked as Ext. W-5. This proforma contains as many as 14 columns and in the 14th column the officer who is to fill up the proforma has to give his view as to whether the candidate is fit for promotion to the next higher scale. Hence it is argued by the union that as per the promotion policy seniority being the main criteria and there being nothing to show that the performance of the workman being unsatisfactory he was not fit for promotion to the next higher grade the management's action in not promoting the concerned workman while promoting his juniors is nothing but arbitrary. All these contentions of the union can be of no avail to it in view of the admitted position that the promotion policy Ext. W-1 of which the proforma Ext. W-5 is a part was adopted by the management in June 1977 whereas the cause of action for the union arose in December 1975 when the management did not promote the concerned workman. Therefore to decide the case of the union reference to the promotion policy of the management fixed in the year 1977 cannot be made. Admittedly there was no promotion policy decided by the management when the cause of action of this case arose. It is not disputed that in December 1975 the management constituted a D.P.C. to consider cases of promotion of clerks from Gr. II to Gr. I. This committee fixed certain policy to be followed by it while considering cases of promotion. A true copy of the policy followed by the D.P.C. filed by the management i. Ext. M-1. This document also contains the names of clerks who were recommended by the committee for promotion from Gr. II to Gr. I. In para 3 of Ext. M-1 it has been clearly mentioned that promotion will be made only from the candidates who have obtained 20 or more marks in PAR evaluation and from amongst such candidates a panel will be drawn up senioritywise to fill up the number of vacancies. Ext. M-2 is a list which shows the names of clerks who were considered for promotion and marks obtained by each while evaluating their performance. This list gives senioritywise names of 137 clerks. Genuineness of this document is not disputed by the union. The position of the concerned workman in this list is 5th according to seniority but he has only obtained 16 marks which has been awarded by D.P.C. As per the policy adopted by D.P.C. mentioned above the concerned workman not having secured minimum number of marks his case was not recommended for promotion even though his juniors were recommended. There is nothing to show that D.P.C. while awarding marks to the candidates acted arbitrarily. No evidence has been led by the union to show that the members of the D.P.C. were or any one of them was biased against the concerned workman and therefore the committee deliberately awarded low marks to him in order to dis-entitle him for promotion to the next higher grade. In this connection the union relies upon some other documents, namely, Ext. W-2 to W-4. Ext. W-4 is a copy of a award passed by Tribunal No. 2 at Dhanbad in a similar case like the present one. That award shows that the Tribunal for the purpose of considering the claim of the concerned workman for promotion in December 1975

relied upon the promotion policy of the management adopted in June 1977. This according to me could not have been done. Further the award discloses that the learned Tribunal did not agree with D.P.C.'s evaluation so far as the concerned workman in that case was concerned. In that case the workman had obtained 20 marks. In view of earlier recommendation of the concerned workman in that case for promotion to Gr. I by some officers under whom he was working and in view of the entries in the character roll of the concerned workman produced before the Tribunal, the Tribunal held that awarding of 20 marks to the concerned was not proper and that in view of the promotion policy adopted by the management in 1977 the demand of the workman for promotion to higher grade in December 1975 was justified. I do not agree with the reasons given in the award. First of all I have already said that it was not proper for the Tribunal to rely upon the promotion policy of the management adopted in 1977 for deciding a case of promotion in December 1975 merely because character roll of the concerned workman in that case did not show any adverse remark against him. Without any further material the awarding of 20 marks to the workmen in that case could not have been taken to be unjustified. The officers of the management entrusted with the task of deciding cases for promotion are only competent to say how much mark is to be awarded to an individual candidate. It is not open to a court to interfere with the judgement of those officers while awarding marks unless the action of the officers is found to be malafide. Even in such a case the court is not to substitute its own judgement by saying that the candidate in respect of whom mala fide has been found is entitled to higher marks and so is entitled to be promoted. In a case of such nature the court can only remit the case for reconsideration. Similarly is case where there is no adverse remark against any of the candidates considered for promotion still the authority entrusted with the task of deciding cases of promotion has to award marks to each one of the candidates and then on the basis of marks obtained by the candidates have to select which of them are to be promoted. Here also a court cannot say that any particular candidate should have been awarded higher marks. For these reasons in my opinion the union can get no assistance from the said award Ext. W-4. Some other documents relied upon by the union may be considered at this stage. The concerned colliery is a coking coal mine which was nationalised in May 1972. It is not disputed that after take over of the colliery in question management took steps to categorise all its employees working in the colliery. At that time many workmen made representations before the management to be placed in a higher grade. It is also not disputed that the concerned workman since his joining in July 1966 was a clerk in Gr. II and the post he was holding was a post of Sales Assistant. Even though L.A.T. Award which was in force then did not specifically say that a Sales Assistant would be in Gr. II, it is admitted by both parties that many such posts were not categorised in L.A.T. Award and in respect of those posts as per the award discretion was left to the management concerned. Therefore when the management after appointing the concerned workman as a Sales Assistant in July 1966 placed him in clerical Gr. II there could not possibly be any objection to this. So I hold that initially the concerned workman was appointed in Clerk Gr. II. While he was holding this post after nationalisation the management took up the work of proper categorisation of its employees. It was during this period when many workmen were claiming to be placed in higher category the Senior Sales Officer (C) under whom the concerned workman was working at that time wrote a letter to the Chief Industrial Relation on 2-8-73 Ex. W-3 saying that the applicant's case might be taken up for consideration for fixation of proper grade. On receipt of Ext. W-3 the Senior Industrial Relation Officer who is subordinate to Chief Industrial Relation and Personnel wrote to the Senior Sales Officer a reply Ext. W-3(1) on 9-8-73 requiring justification for the claim. In that letter a query was made regarding the designation of the concerned workman. The Senior Sales Officer in reply to Ext. W-3(1) wrote back on 12-12-73 Ext. W.(2) saying that the case of the concerned workman deserved sympathetic consideration. On the basis of these three letters, namely, Exts. W-3(1), and W-3(2) the union argues that in the year 1973 at the time of categorisation of the employees by the management when the

officers under whom the workman was working being satisfied with his satisfactory nature of work recommended his case for sympathetic consideration it must be taken that since that time the concerned workman was considered fit for promotion to higher grade. That being so it is argued that he could not have been found unfit for promotion in 1975. I am afraid such an argument cannot be accepted. At the time when categorisation was going on it may be that the officers under whom the concerned workman was working being satisfied with his work recommended his case for a higher category. But the authority in charge of categorisation who had the final say in the matter did not accept the recommendation of the officers and the concerned workman was allowed to continue in Gr. II even after categorisation. It was open to the workman to raise a dispute at that time on the question of proper categorisation. That he did not do. The reference in the present case is not for proper categorisation. The reference before me relates to the demand of the concerned workman for promotion to Gr. I in December 1975. It has been already noticed that for considering cases for promotion a D.P.C. was constituted by the management in the year 1973 and that committee after deciding the norm to be followed for deciding cases of promotion recommended certain cases and did not recommend the case of the concerned workman. The letters of 1973, namely, Exts. W-3 to W-3(2) which relate to proper categorisation of the concerned workman cannot be relied upon by the union to throw out the recommendation of D.P.C. without any material to show that the said recommendation was malafide and hence not acceptable. So looking at the case from all points of view I do not find any merit in the claim of the union. It is further not disputed that the concerned workman has already been promoted to Gr. I with effect from 9-6-77. The reference in the present case has been made in 1981. It is admitted by the union that in its letter dated 10-12-79 the union raised the present dispute before the conciliation officer but at the same time it is said by the union that prior to 10-12-1979 the concerned workman had made several demands before the management on several occasions for his promotion without any effect. The fact of demand by the workman earlier to 10-12-79 is not admitted by the management and in the absence of any evidence for the union on the point it is very difficult to accept the union's stand that before 10-12-79 the workman made a demand. But in view of admission by both parties before me that the demand before the conciliation officer was made on 10-12-79 I hold that the long after the workman was actually promoted to Gr. I the present demand was made. There is nothing to explain the unreasonable delay on the part of the union in raising its demand and so according to me after the concerned workman was actually promoted to Gr. I on 29-6-77 the present demand was made in order to see if something more could be realised from the management.

For the reasons given above I hold that the demand of the union that the concerned workman should be given the benefit of promotion from Clerk Gr. II to Clerk Gr. I from December 1975 when his juniors have been promoted is not justified and the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered accordingly. In the circumstances there will be no order for costs.

B. K. RAY, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(54)/81-D. III(A)]

नई दिल्ली, 12 मार्च, 1982

कांग आ० 1319.—उपदाम संवाद प्रधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 39) की बारा 7 की उपस्थान (7) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, ऐनीय सरकार मिस्ट्रिनिशन अनुसूची में उल्लिखित प्रधिकारी को प्रंदणान व निकोबार हीप ममूह संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में जाने जाने सभी प्रतिष्ठानों के सर्वधा में, जिसके लिए उक्त प्रधिनियम की बारा 2 के खंड (क) के अधीन ऐनीय सरकार ममूचिन सरकार है, अपील प्रधिकारी के रूप में विनिविष्ट करती है।

मनुसूची

प्रधिकारी का नाम	क्षेत्र
भ्रमापुक्त	अंडमान व निकोबार
भ्रमान व निकोबार	द्वीपसमूह संघ
प्रशासन	राज्य क्षेत्र
[संख्या एच० 11020/2/81-एफ०पी०जी०]	

New Delhi, the 12th March, 1982

S.O. 1319.—In exercise of the powers conferred by subsection (7) of section 7 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 (39 of 1972), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in the Schedule hereto, to be Appellate Authority in relation to all establishments falling in Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar, for which the Central Government is the appropriate Government under clause (a) of section 2 of the said Act:

SCHEDULE

Name of Officer	Area
Labour Commissioner, Andaman and Nicobar Administration.	Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands

[No. H.11020/2/81-FPG]

का० आ० 1320 :—उपवान संदाय प्रधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 39) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रवत् शक्तियों के प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार निम्नलिखित मनुसूची में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को अंडमान व निकोबार द्वीपसमूह संघ राज्य क्षेत्र में प्राप्त वाले सभी प्रतिष्ठानों के संबंध में, जिनके लिए उस प्रधिनियम की धारा 2 के खण्ड (क) के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार समृद्धि भव भरने के लिए विनियोग करती है :

मनुसूची

प्रधिकारी का नाम	क्षेत्र
भ्रम कल्याण प्रधिकारी, मुख्यालय),	अंडमान व निकोबार
भ्रमान व निकोबार	द्वीपसमूह संघ
प्रशासन	राज्य क्षेत्र

[संख्या एच-11020/2/81 एफ०पी०जी०]

पौ० सिन्हा, उप सचिव

S.O.1320.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 (39 of 1792), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in the Schedule hereto, to be the controlling authority in relation to all establishments falling in the Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, for which the Central Government is the appropriate Government under clause (a) of section 2 of the said Act :

SCHEDULE

Name of Officer	Area
Labour Welfare Officer, (Headquarters), Andaman and Nicobar Administration	Union Territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands

[No. H.11020/2/81-FPG]
P. SINHA, Dy. Secy.

पेट्रोलियम, इसायम और उर्वरक भंगालय

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 12 फरवरी, 1982

का० आ० 1321.—यह केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि सोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मथुरा से जलधर (पंजाब) तक पेट्रोलियम पदार्थों के परिवहन के लिए पार्सी पाइप लाइन इंडियन एंडवेल फार्मरेशन द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिये ।

भौर यतः, यह प्रतीत होता है कि पार्सी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एनड्यूबड अनुसूची में वर्गित भूमि में उपयोग का प्रधिकार प्रतिष्ठित करना आवश्यक है ।

प्रतः अब, पेट्रोलियम भौर अनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के प्रधिकार का वर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवत् शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का प्रधिकार अर्पित करने का प्रपत्ता आशय एतत्वादर्थोंप्रियता किया है :

भौर्ते कि उस भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के सीधे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन एंडवेल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मथुरा-जलधर, पार्सी पाइप लाइन प्रोजेक्ट, 705, माता सिंह नगर, जलधर (पंजाब) को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा ।

भौर ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति निनिविष्ट, यह भी करने करेगा कि क्या वह आहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

मनुसूची

तहसील तथा शहर	जिला : जालन्धर	राज्य : पंजाब
नाम ग्राम	क्षमता मं.	क्षेत्रफल
	ह०	ऐ०
1	2	3
ओजा	46/3 मिन	00 08 60
ह० नं० 284	46/4 मिन	00 05 57
	46/7 मिन	00 11 89
	46/14 मिन	00 07 34
	46/15 मिन	00 01 52
	46/16 मिन	00 09 36
	46/17 मिन	00 00 25
	46/28 मिन	00 09 36
	48/5 मिन	00 10 37
	48/6 मिन	00 07 34
	48/15 मिन	00 00 25
	49/10 मिन	00 03 29
	49/11 मिन	00 10 37
	49/20 मिन	00 10 37
	49/21 मिन	00 10 37
	58/1 मिन	00 07 34
	58/2 मिन	00 03 29
	58/9 मिन	00 10 37
	58/10 मिन	00 00 25
	58/12 मिन	00 10 37
	58/19 मिन	00 06 32
	58/74 मिन	00 01 01
	58/102 मिन	00 02 02

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
जुगीया	6/10 मिन	00	09	87	जुलाह माजरा	44/24 मिन	00	07	84
ह० न० 285	6/11 मिन	00	05	57	ह० न० 286	44/23 मिन	00	06	58
	6/12 मिन	00	08	85	—(जारी)	44/5 मिन	00	00	76
	6/18 मिन	00	08	10		44/5 मिन	00	08	10
	6/19 मिन	00	06	58		44/1 मिन	00	04	30
	6/23 मिन	00	07	84		44/9 मिन	00	02	02
	6/24 मिन	00	06	83		44/10 मिन	00	11	69
	7/4 मिन	00	03	04		44/11 मिन	00	00	00
	7/5 मिन	00	10	88		44/12 मिन	00	13	16
	7/6 मिन	00	04	81		44/13 मिन	00	00	76
	11/4 मिन	00	08	60		44/18 मिन	00	13	41
	11/5 मिन	00	06	07		44/19 मिन	00	00	76
	11/6 मिन	00	09	36		44/23 मिन	00	05	57
	12/10 मिन	00	05	31		44/24 मिन	00	09	11
	12/11 मिन	00	10	37		80 मिन	00	01	32
	12/12 मिन	00	04	05					
	12/18 मिन	00	03	04	बड़कुचाल	164 मिन	00	03	04
	12/19 मिन	00	11	64	ह० न० 287	30/16/2 मिन	00	02	02
	12/23 मिन	00	12	40		30/17/2 मिन	00	06	83
	12/24 मिन	00	02	28		30/17/1 मिन	00	01	77
	16/10 मिन	00	01	01		30/24 मिन	00	00	00
	16/11 मिन	00	13	66		30/25 मिन	00	10	37
	16/12 मिन	00	00	25					
	16/18 मिन	00	00	25	बेंगोचाल	4/20 मिन	00	05	82
	16/19 मिन	00	13	41	ह० न० 289	4/21 मिन	00	10	12
	16/20 मिन	00	01	26		4/22/1 मिन	00	04	05
	16/22 मिन	00	01	77		5/3 मिन	00	07	08
	16/23 मिन	00	12	65		5/7 मिन	00	08	85
	17/3 मिन	00	00	00		5/8/1 मिन	00	04	30
	17/4 मिन	00	13	16		5/8/2 मिन	00	00	25
	17/5 मिन	00	01	26		5/14 मिन	00	05	82
	17/6 मिन	00	13	66		5/15 मिन	00	07	84
	17/7 मिन	00	00	25		5/16 मिन	00	08	35
	17/15 मिन	00	00	76		5/26 मिन	00	01	01
	27/3 मिन	00	03	04		10/2 मिन	00	11	89
	27/4 मिन	00	11	89		10/3/3 मिन	00	01	52
	27/6 मिन	00	01	88		10/7 मिन	00	00	51
	27/7 मिन	00	03	79		10/8 मिन	00	11	64
	27/15 मिन	00	04	81		10/13 मिन	00	00	76
	28/11 मिन	00	09	61		10/14 मिन	00	13	41
	28/19 मिन	00	03	29		10/16/1 मिन	00	08	10
	28/20 मिन	00	06	07		10/16/2 मिन	00	03	79
	38 मिन	00	00	76		10/17 मिन	00	01	77
						10/25/2 मिन	00	04	05
जुलाह माजरा	28/25 मिन	00	02	78		11/21 मिन	00	10	12
ह० न० 286	29/21 मिन	00	00	76		12/1/1 मिन	00	05	31
	44/1 मिन	00	13	41		12/1/3 मिन	00	00	76
	44/2 मिन	00	00	25		12/1 मिन	00	08	10
	44/9 मिन	00	11	13		12/8 मिन	00	05	83
	44/10 मिन	00	01	77		12/9 मिन	00	08	10
	44/12 मिन	00	03	54		12/13 मिन	00	10	12
	44/13/1 मिन	00	03	29		12/14 मिन	00	04	05
	44/13/2 मिन	00	06	12		12/15 मिन	00	01	77
	44/17 मिन	00	08	35		12/52 मिन	00	10	12
	44/18 मिन	00	04	05		12/53 मिन	00	01	01

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
फारवडा	12/54 मिन	00	01	52	फारवडा	42/7 मिन	00	11	13
ह० मं० 288	12/70 मिन	00	00	00	ह० मं० 288	42/14 मिन	00	01	77
(जारी)	12/87 मिन	00	00	76	(जारी)	42/15 मिन	00	11	13
	12/88 मिन	00	00	51		42/16 मिन	00	00	25
	11/9 मिन	00	00	51		66 मिन	00	01	01
	11/11 मिन	00	09	61		75 मिन	00	01	49
	11/13 मिन	00	04	05		75 मिन	00	01	53
	11/17 मिन	00	02	28		87 मिन	00	00	76
	11/18 मिन	00	12	14		216 मिन	00	00	76
	11/23 मिन	00	00	00		225 मिन	00	01	26
	11/24 मिन	00	12	65		226 मिन	00	01	26
	11/25 मिन	00	00	51	पैरापठ	1722 मिन	00	01	54
	13/4 मिन	50	00	51	ह० मं० 207	1723 मिन	00	12	10
	13/5 मिन	00	13	66		1724 मिन	00	00	77
	13/6 मिन	00	01	77		1814 मिन	00	12	29
	14/1 मिन	00	00	25		1815 मिन	00	00	19
	14/10 मिन	00	12	40		1816 मिन	00	07	10
	14/11 मिन	00	03	54		1817 मिन	00	01	54
	18/12 मिन	00	10	63		1818 मिन	00	03	76
	19/18 मिन	00	09	36		1864/1 मिन	00	00	38
	19/19 मिन	00	05	31		1865/1 मिन	00	05	57
	14/23 मिन	00	06	83		2194 मिन	00	06	34
	14/24 मिन	00	07	08		2185 मिन	00	04	42
	25/10 मिन	00	04	55		2186 मिन	00	09	02
	25/11/1 मिन	00	04	05		2187 मिन	00	03	83
	25/11/2 मिन	00	05	06		2188 मिन	00	00	77
	25/12/2 मिन	00	02	28		2190 मिन	00	03	84
	25/18 मिन	00	01	01		2191 मिन	00	09	02
	25/19 मिन	00	13	16		2202 मिन	00	01	74
	25/22 मिन	00	00	51		2203 मिन	00	05	78
	25/23 मिन	00	08	60		2204 मिन	00	00	98
	25/24 मिन	00	00	25		2205 मिन	00	00	00
	26/4 मिन	00	08	35		2206 मिन	00	03	07
	26/5 मिन	00	05	82		2211 मिन	00	01	54
	36/6 मिन	00	09	87		2220 मिन	00	04	80
	32/3/3 मिन	00	01	77		2221 मिन	90	05	38
	32/4 मिन	00	12	40		2226 मिन	00	07	49
	32/6/1 मिन	00	03	04		2227 मिन	00	04	42
	32/6/2 मिन	00	07	84		2233 मिन	00	05	57
	32/7/1 मिन	00	03	04		2271 मिन	00	01	54
	32/15/2 मिन	00	04	55		2286 मिन	00	06	91
	33/11 मिन	00	08	60		2287 मिन	00	07	10
	33/19 मिन	00	07	84		2288 मिन	00	06	34
	33/20 मिन	00	06	58		2293 मिन	00	05	76
	33/22 मिन	00	07	34		2294 मिन	00	07	68
	33/23 मिन	00	06	58		2302 मिन	00	07	87
	41/11 मिन	00	01	26		2303 मिन	00	05	57
	41/18 मिन	00	00	25		2307 मिन	00	04	99
	41/20 मिन	00	13	91		2308 मिन	00	09	02
	41/21 मिन	00	01	26		2309 मिन	00	04	22
	41/22 मिन	00	06	83		2310 मिन	00	03	07
	42/3 मिन	00	09	61		2314 मिन	00	03	48
	42/4 मिन	00	04	81		2367 मिन	00	01	54
	42/6/2 मिन	00	02	53		2833 मिन	00	06	34

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
मीरापड ह० न० 207 —(जारी)	2845 मिन	00	01	92	मीरापड ह० न० 207 —(जारी)	3414/मिन	00	07	10
	2846 मिन	00	07	30		3418/मिन	00	04	22
	2848 मिन	00	01	54		3420/मिन	00	00	96
	2851 मिन	00	07	49		3430/मिन (ii Part)	00	03	65
	2852 मिन	00	01	54		3543/मिन	00	09	22
	2856 मिन	00	02	30		3545/मिन	00	03	65
	2857 मिन	00	06	91		3546/मिन	00	10	94
	2858 मिन	00	07	10		3547/मिन	00	00	00
	2859 मिन	00	01	73		3549/मिन	00	00	38
	2864 मिन	00	01	54		3550/मिन	00	11	90
	2865 मिन	00	00	77		3551/मिन	00	02	11
	2874 मिन	00	04	03		3559/मिन	00	01	15
	2906 मिन	00	00	00		3560/मिन	00	11	90
	2907 मिन	00	11	33		3561/मिन	00	00	38
	2908 मिन	00	00	96		3563/मिन	00	08	45
	2909 मिन	00	10	56		3569/मिन	00	00	00
	2910 मिन	00	00	58		3570/मिन	00	11	90
	2914 मिन	00	02	50		3571/मिन	00	02	11
	2915 मिन	00	10	18		3573/मिन	00	01	15
	2918 मिन	00	01	92		3577/मिन	00	00	77
	2919 मिन	00	02	69		3598/मिन	00	05	57
	2931 मिन	00	09	98		3599/मिन	00	12	86
	2932 मिन	00	05	18		3603/मिन	00	06	53
	2933 मिन	00	05	18		3608/मिन	00	01	34
	2934 मिन	00	04	22		3613/मिन	00	04	42
	2935 मिन	00	01	73		3614/मिन	00	08	45
	2937 मिन	00	02	30		3616/मिन	00	08	83
	2996 मिन	00	01	34		3617/मिन	00	05	76
	3281 मिन	00	05	18		3618/मिन	00	07	10
	3283/2 मिन	00	02	11	शेषपुर ह० न० 184		78/21/मिन	00	02
	3283/3 मिन	00	09	79		79/16/मिन	00	03	29
	3283/4 मिन	00	00	00		25/1/मिन	00	11	13
	3283/5 मिन	00	12	48		25/2/मिन	00	01	01
	3316/5 मिन	00	00	19		80/5/मिन	00	00	00
	3322 मिन	00	08	26		81/1/मिन	00	12	40
	3323 मिन	00	06	14		81/2/1/मिन	00	00	51
	3327 मिन	00	04	80		81/9/1/मिन	00	01	52
	3328 मिन	00	09	79		81/9/2/मिन	00	08	60
	3329 मिन	00	03	26		81/10/1/मिन	00	01	01
	3330 मिन	00	11	14		81/12/2/मिन	00	03	53
	3335 मिन	00	00	19		81/13/1/मिन	00	11	13
	3336 मिन	00	10	94		81/17/मिन	00	05	06
	3343 मिन	00	01	73		81/18/मिन	00	06	07
	3359 मिन	00	00	58		397/मिन	00	00	51
	3360 मिन	00	06	91		44/17/1/मिन	00	06	83
	3361 मिन	00	05	57		44/24/2/मिन	00	05	82
	3362 मिन	00	06	14		44/25/1/मिन	00	04	81
	3375/मिन	00	01	34		44/25/2/मिन	00	05	06
	3376/मिन	00	01	73		47/5/2/मिन	00	05	06
	3396/1/मिन	00	00	58		48/1/मिन	00	10	63
	3397/मिन	30	05	95		48/9/1/मिन	00	07	34
	3404/मिन	00	09	41		48/9/2/मिन	00	04	05
	3405/मिन	00	07	10		48/10/मिन	00	04	30
	3412/मिन	00	07	49		48/12/2/मिन	00	03	54
	3413/मिन	00	05	76		48/13/1/मिन	00	09	11

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
बबलौर ह० न० 199 (जारी)	48/13/2 मिन	00	00	00	बबलौर ह० न० 199 —जारी	78/14 मिन	00	06	83
	48/17/1 मिन	00	00	51		78/16 मिन	00	01	01
	48/17/2 मिन	00	00	76		78/17 मिन	00	09	36
	48/18 मिन	00	03	01		78/26 मिन	00	02	78
	48/24 मिन	00	07	59		113 मिन	00	02	02
						118 मिन	00	02	53
	48/26 मिन	00	03	04		122 मिन	00	01	52
	54/1/1 मिन	00	02	02		123 मिन	00	01	77
	54/11/2 मिन	00	01	77		148 मिन	00	02	02
	54/11/3 मिन	00	00	00		149 मिन	00	01	77
	54/11/4 मिन	00	01	26		150 मिन	00	03	04
	54/11/5 मिन	00	00	00		156 मिन	00	06	83
	54/11/6 मिन	00	01	52		401 मिन	00	00	51
	54/11/7 मिन	00	03	79		434 मिन	00	00	76
	54/12 मिन	00	00	51		447 मिन	00	00	76
	54/18/3 मिन	00	02	02					
	54/18/4 मिन	00	11	13	टेंडा ह० न० 197	37/24/1 मिन	00	00	00
	54/22 मिन	00	02	78		37/24/2 मिन	00	01	26
	54/23 मिन	00	11	13		37/25/2 मिन	00	01	77
	55/4 मिन	00	10	12		51/9/2 मिन	00	03	29
	55/5 मिन	00	04	05		51/10/2 मिन	00	09	61
	55/6 मिन	00	11	13		51/12 मिन	00	11	89
	55/15 मिन	00	00	00		51/13/2 मिन	00	03	29
	63/3 मिन	00	05	06		51/17/2 मिन	00	03	54
	63/4/1 मिन	00	06	58		51/18 मिन	00	09	11
	63/4/2 मिन	00	01	52		51/24 मिन	00	11	38
	63/8/2 मिन	00	00	78		51/25 मिन	00	03	54
	63/8/3 मिन	00	01	01		51/27 मिन	00	02	78
	63/8/4 मिन	00	02	78		52/5/1 मिन	00	00	25
	63/7 मिन	00	08	10		52/5/2 मिन	00	00	25
	63/15 मिन	00	08	35		53/6/1 मिन	00	06	58
	64/20/1 मिन	00	08	10		53/5/2 मिन	00	03	29
	64/20/2 मिन	00	01	77		54/1/2 मिन	00	03	29
	64/21/1 मिन	00	00	51		54/9/2 मिन	00	04	55
	64/21/2 मिन	00	00	51		54/10 मिन	00	10	88
	64/22 मिन	00	10	12		54/12/1 मिन	00	04	05
	66/20/2 मिन	00	01	01		54/12/2 मिन	00	06	32
	66/21 मिन	00	13	16		54/13 मिन	00	05	31
	67/2/1 मिन	00	01	01		54/17/2 मिन	00	03	84
	67/3/1 मिन	00	00	51		54/18/1 मिन	00	09	87
	67/3/2 मिन	00	02	53		54/24 मिन	00	09	61
	67/7/1 मिन	00	00	51		54/25/1 मिन	00	02	28
	67/7/2 मिन	00	06	07		54/25/2 मिन	00	02	78
	67/8/1 मिन	00	05	82		54/25/3 मिन	00	00	51
	67/8/2 मिन	00	00	76		54/27 मिन	00	01	52
	67/8/3 मिन	00	01	52		63/1 मिन	00	06	07
	67/14 मिन	00	10	12		63/9 मिन	00	07	34
	67/15 मिन	00	03	54		63/10 मिन	00	08	60
	67/16/1 मिन	00	05	06		63/12 मिन	00	07	84
	67/16/2 मिन	00	03	82		63/13 मिन	00	07	34
	67/23/2 मिन	00	00	51		63/17 मिन	00	07	84
	78/2 मिन	00	11	13		63/18 मिन	00	07	84
	78/8 मिन	00	08	60		63/24 मिन	00	07	08
	78/9 मिन	00	05	06		63/25 मिन	00	07	84
	78/13 मिन	00	07	34		64/5/1 मिन	00	00	31

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
महियाली ह० न० ५ (आरी)	47/17 मिन	00	09	87	जड़भाली ह० न० २ —आरी	27/25/2 मिन	00	02	02
	47/18 मिन	00	04	55		28/21/1 मिन	00	09	87
	47/24/2 मिन	00	05	57		28/21/3 मिन	00	00	00
	47/25 मिन	00	09	36		31/1/1 मिन	00	02	28
	47/27 मिन	00	00	25		31/1/2 मिन	00	03	04
	55/1/1 मिन	00	07	08		31/2 मिन	00	09	61
	55/1/2 मिन	00	00	76		31/8/2 मिन	00	01	76
	55/9/1 मिन	00	02	78		31/8/4 मिन	50	06	59
	55/9/2 मिन	00	05	82		31/9/1 मिन	00	00	51
	55/10/1 मिन	00	04	81		31/9/2 मिन	00	03	31
	55/10/2 मिन	00	01	01		31/13/1 मिन	00	00	25
	55/10/4 मिन	00	00	51		31/13/3 मिन	00	05	57
	56/5 मिन	00	06	58		31/13/4 मिन	00	00	61
	73 मिन	00	01	26		31/14/1 मिन	00	01	01
	272 मिन	00	00	76		31/14/2/1 मिन	00	07	08
	273 मिन	00	00	76		31/16/1 मिन	00	04	55
	299 मिन	00	00	76		31/16/2 मिन	00	02	78
						31/17 मिन	00	06	58
जड़भाली ह० न० २	18/14 मिन	00	07	84		31/25/1 मिन	00	03	04
	18/15 मिन	00	03	54		31/25/2 मिन	00	05	31
	18/16/1 मिन	00	04	55		32/21 मिन	00	05	82
	18/16/2 मिन	00	07	34		33/1 मिन	00	09	61
	18/16/3 मिन	00	00	00		33/2 मिन	00	05	31
	17/20/3 मिन	00	02	78		33/9/1 मिन	00	03	29
	17/21/1 मिन	00	07	59		33/9/2 मिन	00	06	07
	17/21/2 मिन	00	05	06		33/8 मिन	00	04	55
	17/22/2 मिन	00	02	02		33/13/1 मिन	00	07	31
	20/2 मिन	00	13	16		33/13/2 मिन	00	04	05
	20/3 मिन	00	01	77		33/14/2 मिन	00	03	54
	20/7/2 मिन	00	01	26		33/17/1 मिन	00	02	28
	20/8/1 मिन	00	06	07		33/17/2 मिन	00	08	51
	20/8/2 मिन	00	06	07		20/31 मिन	00	12	65
	20/9 मिन	00	00	00		137 मिन	00	01	52
	20/13/1 मिन	00	00	25		138 मिन	00	03	04
	20/14/1 मिन	00	09	36		269 मिन	00	00	00
	20/14/2 मिन	00	04	30		276 मिन	00	00	70
	20/15/2 मिन	00	00	76		277 मिन	00	00	76
	20/16/1 मिन	00	06	58		286 मिन	00	00	76
	20/16/2 मिन	00	06	83	कोत्तरा ह० न० १	4/11 मिन	00	11	89
	20/17/2 मिन	00	00	76		4/19 मिन	00	11	13
	20/25/2 मिन	00	01	26		4/20 मिन	00	03	54
	21/20/2 मिन	00	00	25		4/22 मिन	00	04	55
	21/1 मिन	00	02	53		4/23/1 मिन	00	09	87
	27/1/2 मिन	00	00	25		4/23/2 मिन	00	00	25
	27/2/1 मिन	00	04	55		5/4 मिन	00	08	85
	27/2/2 मिन	00	07	34		5/5 मिन	00	00	00
	27/8 मिन	00	11	64		5/6 मिन	00	12	40
	27/9 मिन	00	02	28		5/7 मिन	00	02	02
	27/13/1 मिन	00	01	52		5/15 मिन	00	02	78
	27/13/2 मिन	00	01	52		8/3 मिन	00	05	31
	27/14/1 मिन	00	11	64		8/4 मिन	00	08	60
	27/14/2 मिन	00	00	00		8/6 मिन	00	08	60
	26/16/2 मिन	00	10	88		8/7 मिन	00	01	31
	27/17 मिन	00	03	79		8/15 मिन	00	06	83
	27/25/1 मिन	00	02	78		9/11/1 मिन	00	07	59

1	2	3	4	5
बोतांरा ह०म० 1	9/19 मिन	00	08	10
—जारी	9/20/1 मिन	00	03	29
	9/20/2 मिन	00	00	51
	9/20/3 मिन	00	02	02
	9/22/1 मिन	00	00	51
	9/22/2 मिन	00	05	57
	11/20 मिन	00	03	04
	11/21/1 मिन	00	02	78
	11/21/2 मिन	00	08	35
	11/22/1 मिन	00	03	79
	11/22/2 मिन	00	02	28
	12/2 मिन	00	10	12
	12/7/2 मिन	00	00	00
	12/8 मिन	00	11	64
	12/9 मिन	00	08	07
	12/13 मिन	00	02	53
	12/14/1 मिन	00	03	54
	12/16/2 मिन	00	08	10
	23/2/1/1 मिन	00	08	85
	23/2/1/2 मिन	00	00	00
	32/3/1/1 मिन	00	01	77
	23/3/1/2 मिन	00	00	00
	23/3/2/3 मिन	00	00	76
	23/7/2 मिन	00	04	55
	23/8/1 मिन	00	01	26
	23/8/2 मिन	00	08	35
	23/8/3 मिन	00	00	51
	23/14/1 मिन	00	02	78
	63 मिन	00	14	67
	76 मिन	00	02	53
	77 मिन	00	01	26
	271 मिन	00	00	76
	272 मिन	00	00	76
	291 मिन	00	00	76

तहसील नवनसहार, जिला अलीगढ़ (पंजाब) के सरकारी/स्थानीय निकायों की भूमि की सूची जहाँ से पाइपलाइन गुजरेगी/पार होगी :—

क्रम नं.	वास्तविक नाम	वास्तविक नं.	H	A	वर्गीकृत
1.	शेषपुरा ह०म०				
182.		105 मिन	00	03	04
2.	खोटरान ह० म० 1	74 मिन	00	04	30
3.	राइटपुरा ह० म०				
107.		98 मिन	00	20	99
4.	दैवलीर ह० म०				
109.		101 मिन	00	09	87
		104 मिन	00	02	53
5.	धरापुर ह० म०				
181.		2340 मिन	00	03	84
		2227 मिन	00	03	65
		3420 मिन	00	04	61

टी० एन० परमेश्वरन, अधिकारी, सचिव
[सं० 12020/2/82-प्र०]

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND
FERTILIZERS

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 12th February, 1982

S.O. 1321.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum products from Mathura in Uttar Pradesh to Jullundur in Punjab pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas, it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto :

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Mathura-Jullundur Pipeline 705, Mata Singh Nagar, Jullundur (Pb.).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Tehsil, Nawak Shahr District : Jullundur State : Punjab

Name of village	Khasra No.	Area		
1	2	H	A	Sq. M
		3	4	5
KHOJA .No. 284	46/3 Min	00	08	60
	46/4 Min	00	05	57
	46/7 Min	00	11	89
	46/14 Min	00	07	34
	46/15 Min	00	01	52
	46/16 Min	00	09	36
	46/17 Min	00	00	25
	46/25 Min	00	09	36
	48/5 Min	00	10	37
	48/6 Min	00	07	34
	48/15 Min	00	00	25
	49/10 Min	00	03	29
	49/11 Min	00	10	37
	49/20 Min	00	10	37
	49/21 Min	00	10	37
	58/1 Min	00	07	34
	58/2 Min	00	03	29
	58/9 Min	00	10	37
	58/10 Min	00	00	25
	58/12 Min	00	10	37
	58/19 Min	00	06	32
	74 Min	00	01	01
	58/102 Min	00	02	02
JHUNGLI H. No. 285	6/10 Min	00	09	87
	6/11 Min	00	05	57
	6/12 Min	00	08	85
	6/18 Min	00	08	10
	6/19 Min	00	06	58
	6/23 Min	00	07	84
	6/24 Min	00	06	83
	7/4 Min	00	03	04
	7/5 Min	00	10	88
	7/6 Min	00	04	81
	11/4 Min	00	08	60
	11/5 Min	00	06	07

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
JHUNGIAN H. No. 285	11/6 Min 12/10 Min 12/11 Min 12/12 Min 12/18 Min 12/19 Min 12/23 Min 12/24 Min 16/10 Min 16/11 Min 16/12 Min 16/18 Min 16/19 Min 16/20 Min 16/22 Min 16/23 Min 17/3 Min 17/4 Min 17/5 Min 17/6 Min 17/7 Min 17/15 Min 27/3 Min 27/4 Min 27/6 Min 27/7 Min 27/15 Min 28/11 Min 28/19 Min 28/20 Min 39 Min 28/25 Min 29/21 Min 44/1 Min 44/2 Min 44/9 Min 44/10 Min 44/12 Min 44/13/1 Min 44/13/2 44/17 Min 44/18 min 44/24 Min 44/25 Min 45/5 Min 46/5 Min 47/1 Min 47/9 Min 47/10 Min 47/11 Min 47/12 Min 47/13 Min 47/18 Min 47/19 Min 47/23 Min 47/24 Min 80 Min 164 Min Khar Huwal H. No. 287	00 09 36 00 05 31 00 10 37 00 04 05 00 03 04 00 11 64 00 12 40 00 02 28 00 01 01 00 13 66 00 00 25 00 00 25 00 13 41 00 01 26 00 01 77 00 12 65 00 12 00 00 13 16 00 01 26 00 13 66 00 00 25 00 00 76 00 03 04 00 11 89 00 01 88 00 03 79 00 04 81 00 09 61 00 03 29 00 06 07 00 00 76 00 02 78 00 00 76 00 13 41 00 00 25 00 11 13 00 01 77 00 03 54 00 03 29 00 06 32 00 08 35 00 04 05 00 07 84 00 05 58 00 00 76 0 08 10 00 04 30 00 02 02 00 11 89 00 00 00 00 13 16 00 00 76 00 13 41 00 00 76 00 05 57 00 09 11 00 01 52 00 03 04 30/16/2 Min 30/17/2 Min 30/17/1 Min 30/24 Min 30/25 Min 4/20 Min 4/21 Min 4/22/1 Min	BEGOWAL H. No. 289	5/3 Min 5/7 Min 5/8/1 Min 5/8/2 Min 5/14 Min 5/15 Min 5/16 Min 5/26 Min 10/2 Min 10/3/2 Min 10/7 Min 10/8 Min 10/13 Min 10/14 Min 10/16/2 Min 10/16/2 Min 10/17 Min 10/25/2 Min 11/21 Min 12/1/1 Min 12/1/2 Min 12/2 Min 12/8 Min 12/9 Min 12/13 Min 12/14 Min 12/17 Min 11/9 Min 11/12 Min 11/13 Min 11/17 Min 11/18 Min 11/23 Min 11/24 Min 11/25 Min 13/4 Min 13/5 Min 13/6 Min 14/1 Min 14/10 Min 14/11 Min 14/12 Min 14/18 Min 14/19 Min 14/23 Min 14/24 Min 25/10 Min 25/11/1 Min 25/11/2 Min 25/12/2 Min 25/18 Min 25/19 Min 25/22 Min 25/23 Min 25/24 Min 26/4 Min 26/5 Min 26/6 Min	00 07 08 00 08 85 00 04 30 00 00 25 00 05 82 00 07 84 00 08 35 00 01 01 00 11 89 00 01 52 00 00 51 00 11 64 00 00 76 00 13 41 00 08 10 00 03 79 00 01 77 00 04 05 00 10 12 00 05 31 00 00 76 00 08 10 00 10 12 00 04 05 00 01 77 00 00 51 00 00 51 00 09 61 00 04 05 00 01 77 00 02 28 00 12 14 00 00 00 00 12 65 00 00 51 00 13 66 00 01 77 00 00 25 00 00 31 00 01 77 00 00 36 00 00 31 00 06 83 00 01 77 00 00 00 00 10 37 00 05 82 00 10 12 00 04 05	00 07 08 00 08 85 00 04 30 00 00 25 00 05 82 00 07 84 00 08 35 00 01 01 00 11 89 00 01 52 00 00 51 00 11 64 00 00 76 00 13 41 00 08 10 00 03 79 00 01 77 00 04 05 00 10 12 00 05 31 00 00 76 00 08 10 00 10 12 00 04 05 00 01 77 00 00 51 00 00 51 00 09 61 00 04 05 00 01 77 00 02 28 00 12 14 00 00 00 00 12 65 00 00 51 00 13 66 00 01 77 00 00 25 00 00 31 00 01 77 00 00 36 00 00 31 00 06 83 00 01 77 00 00 00 00 10 37 00 05 82 00 10 12 00 04 05			
BEGOWAL N. No. 289	4/20 Min 4/21 Min 4/22/1 Min	00 04 05							

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
PHAMBRA	32/3/3 Min	00	01	77	Aurapur No. 207	2302/Min	00	07	87
H. No. 268	32/4 Min	00	12	40		2303/Min	00	,05	57
	32/6/1 Min	00	03	04		2307 /Min	00	04	99
	32/6/2 Min	00	07	84		2308/Min	90	09	02
	32/7/1 Min	00	03	04		2309/Min	00	04	22
	32/15/2 Min	00	04	55		2310/Min	00	03	07
	33/11 Min	00	08	60		2314/Min	00	08	45
	33/19 Min	00	07	84		2367/Min	00	01	54
	33/20 Min	00	06	58		2833/Min	00	06	34
	33/22 Min	00	07	84		2845/Min	00	01	92
	33/23 Min	00	06	58		2846/Min	00	07	30
						2848/Min	00	01	54
	41/11 Min	00	01	26		2851/Mih	00	07	49
	41/19 Min	00	00	25		2852/Min	00	01	54
	41/20 Min	00	13	91		2856/Min	00	02	30
	41/21 Min	00	01	26		2857/Min	00	06	91
	41/22 Min	00	06	83		2858/Min	00	07	10
	42/3 Min	00	09	61		2859/Min	00	01	73
	42/4 Min	00	04	81		2864/Min	00	01	54
	42/6/2 Min	00	02	53		2865/Min	00	00	77
	42/7 Min	00	11	13		2874/Min	00	04	03
	42/14 Min	00	01	77		2906/Min	00	00	00
	42/15 Min	00	11	13		2907/Min	00	11	33
	42/16 Min	00	00	25		2908 Min	00	00	96
	66/Min	00	01	01		2909 Min	00	10	56
	73/Min	00	01	52		1910 Min	00	00	58
	75/Min	00	01	52		2914 Min	00	02	50
	87/Min	00	00	76		2015 Min	00	10	18
	216/Min	00	00	76		2918 Min	00	01	92
	225/Min	00	01	26		2919 Min	00	02	69
	226/Min	00	01	26		2931 Min	00	09	98
						2932 Min	00	05	18
ARAPUR	1722/Min	00	01	54		2933 Min	00	05	18
H. No. 207	1723/Min	00	12	10		2934 Min	00	04	22
	1724/Min	00	00	77		2935 Min	00	01	73
	1814/Min	00	12	29		2937 Min	00	02	30
	1815/Min	00	00	19		2996 Min	00	01	34
	1816/Min	00	07	10		3281 Min	00	05	18
	1817/Min	00	01	54		3283/2 Min	00	02	11
	1818/Min	00	05	76		3283/3 Min	00	09	79
	1864/1/Min	00	00	38		3283/4 Min	00	00	00
	1963/1 Min	00	05	57		3283/5 Min	00	12	48
	2184/Min	00	06	34		3316/3 Min	00	00	19
	2185/Min	00	04	42		3322 Min	00	08	26
	2186/Min	00	09	02		3323 Min	00	06	14
	2187/Min	00	03	84		3327 Min	00	04	80
	2188/Min	00	00	77		3328 Min	00	09	79
	2190 /Min	00	03	84		3329 Min	00	03	26
	2191/Min	00	09	02		3330 Min	00	11	14
	2202/Min	00	01	73		3335 Min	00	00	19
	2203/Min	00	05	76		3336 Min	00	10	94
	2204/Min	00	00	96		3343 Min	00	01	73
	2205/Min	00	00	00		3359 Min	00	00	58
	2206/Min	00	03	07		3360 Min	00	06	91
	2211/Min	00	01	54		3361 Min	00	05	57
	2220/Min	00	04	80		3362 Min	00	06	14
	2221/Min	00	05	38		3375 Min	00	01	34
	2226/Min	00	07	49		3376 Min	00	01	73
	2227/Min	00	04	42		3396/1 Min	00	00	58
	2233/Min	00	05	57		3397 Min	00	05	95
	2271/Min	00	01	54		3404 Min	00	09	41
	2286/Min	00	06	91		3405 Min	00	07	10
	2287/Min	00	07	10		3412 Min	00	07	49
	2288/Min	00	06	34		3413 Min	00	05	76
	2293/Min	00	05	76		3414 Min	00	07	10
	2294/Min	00	07	68		3418 Min	00	04	22

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Aurapur H. No. 207	3420 Min	00	00	96	Bakhlaur H. No. 199	54/11/5 Min	00	00	00
	3420 (ii part) Min	00	03	65		54/11/6 Min	00	01	52
	3543 Min	00	09	22		54/11/7 Min	00	03	79
	3545 Min	00	03	65		54/22 Min	00	00	51
	3546 Min	00	10	94		54/19/3 Min	00	02	02
	3547 Min	00	00	00		54/19/4 Min	00	11	13
	3549 Min	00	00	38		54/22 Min	00	02	78
	3550 Min	00	11	90		54/23 Min	00	11	13
	3551 Min	00	02	11		55/4 Min	00	10	12
	3559 Min	00	01	15		55/5 Min	00	04	05
	3560 Min	00	11	90		55/6 Min	00	11	13
	3561 Min	00	00	38		55/15 Min	00	00	00
	3568 Min	00	08	45		63/3 Min	00	05	06
	3569 Min	00	00	00		63/4/1 Min	00	06	58
	3570 Min	00	11	90		63/4/2 Min	00	01	52
	3571 Min	00	02	11		63/6/2 Min	00	00	76
	3573 Min	00	01	15		63/6/3 Min	00	01	01
	3577 Min	00	00	77		63/6/4 Min	00	02	78
	3598 Min	00	05	57		63/7 Min	00	08	10
	3599 Min	00	12	86		63/15 Min	00	08	35
	3605 Min	00	06	53		64/20/1 Min	00	08	10
	3608 Min	00	01	34		64/20/2 Min	00	01	77
	3613 Min	00	04	42		64/21/1 Min	00	00	51
	3614 Min	00	08	45		64/21/2 Min	00	00	51
	3616 Min	00	08	83		64/22 Min	00	10	12
	3617 Min	00	05	76		66/20/2 Min	00	01	01
	3618 Min	00	07	10		66/21 Min	00	13	16
						67/2/1 Min	00	01	01
Shekhupur H. No. 182	78/21 Min	00	02	02		67/3/1 Min	00	00	51
	79/16 Min	00	03	29		67/3/2 Min	00	02	53
	79/25/1 Min	00	11	13		67/7/1 Min	00	00	51
	79/25/2 Min	00	01	01		67/7/2 Min	00	06	07
	80/5 Min	00	00	00		67/8/1 Min	00	05	82
	81/1 Min	00	12	40		67/8/2 Min	00	00	76
	81/2/1 Min	00	00	51		67/8/3 Min	00	01	52
	81/9/1 Min	00	01	52		67/14 Min	00	10	12
	81/9/2 Min	00	08	60		67/15 Min	00	03	54
	81/10/1 Min	00	01	01		67/16/1 Min	00	05	06
	81/12/2 Min	00	02	53		67/16/2 Min	00	05	82
	81/13/1 Min	00	11	13		67/25/2 Min	00	00	51
	81/17 Min	00	05	06		78/2 Min	00	11	13
	81/18 Min	00	06	07		78/8 Min	00	08	60
	397 Min	00	00	51		78/13 Min	00	07	34
						78/14 Min	00	06	83
Bakhlaur H. No. 199	44/17/1 Min	00	06	83		78/16 Min	00	01	01
	44/24/2 Min	00	05	82		78/17 Min	00	09	36
	44/25/1 Min	00	04	81		78/26 Min	00	02	78
	44/25/2 Min	00	05	06		113 Min	00	02	02
	47/5/2 Min	00	03	06		118 Min	00	02	53
	48/1 Min	00	10	63		122 Min	00	01	52
	48/9/1 Min	00	07	34		123 Min	00	01	77
	48/9/2 Min	00	04	05		148 Min	00	02	02
	48/10 Min	00	04	30		149 Min	00	01	77
	48/12/2 Min	00	03	54		150 Min	00	03	04
	48/13/1 Min	00	09	11		158 Min	00	06	83
	48/13/2 Min	00	00	00		401 Min	00	00	51
	48/17/1 Min	00	00	51		434 Min	00	00	76
	48/17/2 Min	00	00	76		447 Min	00	00	76
	48/18 Min	00	01	01					
	48/24 Min	00	07	59	Ratinda H. No. 197	37/24/1 Min	00	00	00
	48/26 Min	00	03	04		37/24/2 Min	00	01	26
	54/1/1 Min	00	02	02		37/25/2 Min	00	01	77
	54/11/2 Min	00	01	77		51/9/2 Min	00	03	29
	54/11/3 Min	00	00	00		51/10/2 Min	00	09	61
	54/11/4 Min	00	01	26		51/12 Min	00	11	89

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Ratinda H. No. 197	51/13/2 Min	00	03	29	Chahalkalan	294 Min	00	01	54
	51/17/2 Min	00	03	54	H. No. 196	308 Min	00	02	69
	51/18 Min	00	09	11		309 Min	00	04	99
	51/24 Min	00	11	38		310 Min	00	05	38
	51/25 Min	00	03	54		314 Min	00	00	19
	51/27 Min	00	02	78		315 Min	00	00	77
	52/5/1 Min	00	00	25		316 Min	00	04	80
	52/5/2 Min	00	00	25		317 Min	00	00	77
	53/5/1 Min	00	06	58		319 Min	00	08	45
	53/5/2 Min	00	03	29		341 Min	00	05	18
	54/1/2 Min	00	03	29		342 Min	00	02	11
	54/9/2 Min	00	04	55		343 Min	00	05	95
	54/10 Min	00	10	88		344 Min	00	07	68
	54/12/1 Min	00	04	05		382 Min	00	00	77
	54/12/2 Min	00	06	32		383 Min	00	04	61
	54/13 Min	00	05	31		384 Min	00	06	72
	54/17/2 Min	00	03	54		389 Min	00	01	34
	54/18/1 Min	00	09	87		403 Min	00	04	80
	54/24 Min	00	09	61		405 Min	00	08	64
	54/25/1 Min	00	02	28		407 Min	00	05	38
	54/25/2 Min	00	02	78		410 Min	00	04	61
	54/25/3 Min	00	00	51		411 Min	00	01	34
	54/27 Min	00	01	52		412 Min	00	06	72
	63/1 Min	00	06	07		413 Min	00	00	96
	63/9 Min	00	07	34		414 Min	00	00	00
	63/10 Min	00	08	60		421 Min	00	00	58
	63/12 Min	00	07	84		422 Min	00	06	53
	63/13 Min	00	07	34		436 Min	00	09	41
	63/17 Min	00	07	84		437 Min	00	04	03
	63/18 Min	00	07	84		442 Min	00	02	69
	63/24 Min	00	07	08		444 Min	00	06	34
	63/25 Min	00	07	84		445 Min	00	03	46
	64/3/1 Min	00	00	51		937 Min	00	00	96
	64/5/2 Min	00	07	08		959 Min	00	10	18
	68/5 Min	00	05	57		962 Min	00	00	00
	69/1 Min	00	07	34		963 Min	00	10	94
	69/9 Min	00	07	84		964 Min	00	03	07
	69/10/1 Min	00	07	84		967 Min	00	02	69
	69/12/1 Min	00	01	01		968 Min	00	11	71
	69/12/3 Min	00	04	30		969 Min	00	02	11
	69/12/4 Min	00	01	52		970 Min	00	13	82
	69/13/1 Min	00	08	35		971 Min	00	02	30
	69/13/2 Min	00	00	00		972 Min	00	00	19
	69/17 Min	00	02	53		975 Min	00	00	19
	69/18 Min	00	06	32		991 Min	00	00	96
	105 Min	00	01	26	Mandiall	31/16/4 Min	00	02	78
	107 Min	00	01	52	H. No. 5	31/17 Min	00	08	60
	448 Min	00	00	51		31/25 Min	00	12	40
	449 Min	00	02	02		32/21 Min	00	02	02
	470 Min	00	00	76		43/1/1 Min	00	06	38
	474 Min	00	01	52		43/1/2 Min	00	01	01
Ulkalan No. 196	173 Min	00	05	95		43/1/4 Min	00	05	57
	174 Min	00	02	50		43/2/2 Min	00	01	52
	180 Min	00	06	91		43/8 Min	00	13	13
	193 Min	00	04	03		43/9/1 Min	00	06	32
	194 Min	00	00	00		43/9/2 Min	00	07	34
	195 Min	00	02	88		43/10 Min	00	01	25
	196 Min	00	04	80		43/12/1 Min	00	00	51
	197 Min	00	04	42		43/13/1 Min	00	13	16
	198 Min	00	03	65		43/13/2 Min	00	00	51
	199 Min	00	00	77		43/14/1 Min	00	00	51
	260 Min	00	04	80		43/16 Min	00	00	25
	261 Min	00	04	80		43/17 Min	00	13	66
	262 Min	00	04	42		43/18/1 Min	00	01	11
						43/24/1 Min	00	01	01

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mandiali	43/24/2 Min	00	00	51	Jandiali	27/17 Min	00	03	79
H. No. 5	43/25/1 Min	00	03	29	Contd.	27/25/1 Min	00	02	78
	43/25/2 Min	00	08	35		27/25/2 Min	00	02	02
	44/5/1 Min	00	00	00		28/21/1 Min	00	09	87
	46/5 Min	00	02	28		28/21/3 Min	00	00	00
	47/1 Min	02	12	40		31/1/1 Min	00	02	28
	47/9 Min	00	10	88		31/1/2 Min	00	03	04
	47/10/1 Min	0*	02	28		31/2 Min	00	09	61
	47/12/1 Min	00	02	02		31/8/2 Min	00	01	76
	47/12/2 Min	0*	03	77		31/8/4 Min	00	06	58
	48/13/1 Min	00	00	25		31/9/1 Min	00	00	51
	47/13/2 Min	00	10	37		31/9/2 Min	00	03	31
	47/17 Min	00	09	87		31/13/1 Min	00	00	25
	47/18 Min	00	04	55		31/13/3 Min	00	05	57
	47/24/2 Min	00	05	57		31/13/4 Min	00	00	51
	47/25 Min	00	09	36		31/14/1 Min	00	01	11
	47/27 Min	00	00	25		31/14/2/1 Min	00	07	08
	55/1/1 Min	00	07	08		31/16/1 Min	00	04	55
	55/1/2 Min	00	00	76		31/16/2 Min	00	05	78
	55/9/1 Min	00	02	78		31/17 Min	00	06	58
	55/9/2 Min	00	05	82		31/25/1 Min	00	03	04
	55/10/1 Min	00	04	81		31/25/2 Min	00	05	31
	55/10/2 Min	00	01	01		32/21 Min	00	05	82
	55/10/4 Min	00	00	51		33/1 Min	00	09	61
	56/5 Min	00	06	58		33/2 Min	00	05	31
	73 Min	00	01	26		33/9/1 Min	00	03	29
	272 Min	00	00	76		33/9/2 Min	00	06	67
	273 Min	00	00	76		33/8 Min	00	04	55
	299 Min	00	00	76		33/13/1 Min	00	07	34
						33/13/2 Min	00	04	05
Jandiali	18/14 Min	00	07	84		33/14/2 Min	00	03	*
H. No. 2	18/15 Min	00	03	54		33/17/1 Min	00	02	*
	18/16/1 Min	00	04	55		33/17/2 Min	00	08	*
	18/16/2 Min	00	07	34		20/31 Min	00	12	*
	18/16/3 Min	00	00	00		137 Min.	00	01	*
	17/20/3 Min	00	02	78		138 Min	00	03	*
	17/21/1 Min	00	07	39		269 Min	00	00	*
	17/21/2 Min	00	03	06		276 Min	00	00	*
	17/22/2 Min	00	02	02		277 Min	00	00	*
	20/2 Min	00	13	16		286 Min	00	00	*
	20/3 Min	00	01	77					
	20/7/2 Min	00	01	26	Khotchān	4/11 Min	00	11	
	20/8/1 Min	00	06	07	H. No. 1	4/10 Min	00	11	
	20/8/2 Min	00	06	07		4/20 Min	00	03	
	20/9 Min	00	00	00		4/22 Min	00	04	
	20/13/1 Min	00	00	23		4/33/1 Min	00	09	
	20/14/1 Min	00	09	36		4/23/2 Min	00	00	
	20/14/2 Min	00	04	30		5/4 Min	00	08	
	20/15/2 Min	00	00	76		5/5 Min	00	00	
	20/16/1 Min	00	06	58		5/6 Min	00	12	
	20/16/2 Min	00	06	83		5/7 Min	00	05	
	20/17/2 Min	00	00	76		5/15 Min	00	07	
	20/25/2 Min	00	01	26		8/3 Min	00	03	
	21/20/2 Min	00	00	23		8/4 Min	00	4	
	21/1/1 Min	00	02	53		8/6 Min	00	1	
	27/1/2 Min	00	00	25		8/7 Min	00		
	27/2/1 Min	00	04	55		8/15 Min	00		
	27/2/2 Min	00	07	34		9/11/1 Min	00		
	27/8 Min	00	11	64		9/19 Min	00		
	27/9 Min	00	02	28		9/20/1 Min	00		
	27/13/1 Min	00	01	52		9/20/2 Min	00		
	27/13/2 Min	00	01	52		9/20/3 Min	00		
	27/14/1 Min	00	11	64		9/22/1 Min	00		
	27/14/2 Min	00	00	00		9/22/2 Min	00		
	27/16/2 Min	00	10	88		11/20 Min	00		
						11/21/1 Min	00		

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Khotran	11/21/2 Min	00	08	35		1271 Min	00	00	76
Contd.	11/22/1 Min	00	03	79		272 Min	00	00	00
	11/22 2 Min	00	02	28		291 Min	00	00	76
	12/2 Min	00	10	12					
	12/7/2 Min	00	00	00	List of Government/Local Bodies Land through which the pipeline has to pass in Tehsil Nawanshahar. Dist. Jullundur (PB)				
	12/8 Min	00	11	64					
	12/9 Min	00	06	07					
	13 Min	00	02	53					
	12/14/1 Min	00	03	54					
	12/16/2 Min	00	08	10					
	23/2/1/1 Min	00	08	85					
	23/2/1/2 Min	00	00	00					
	23/3/1/1 Min	00	01	77					
	23/3/1/2 Min	00	00	00					
	22/3/2/3 Min	00	00	76					
	23/7/2 Min	00	04	55					
	23/8/1 Min	00	01	26					
	23/8/2 Min	00	08	35					
	23/8/3 Min	00	00	51					
	23/14/1 Min	00	02	78					
	63 Min	00	14	67					
	76 Min	00	02	53					
	77 Min	00	01	26					

Sr. No.	Name of Vill.	Khasra No.	H	A	Sq. M
1.	Shekhupura	105 Min	00	03	04
	H. No. 182				
2.	Khotran H. No. 1	74 Min	00	04	30
3.	Raitinda				
	H. No. 197	98 Min	00	20	99
4.	Bakhlaur	101 Min	00	09	87
	H. No. 199	104 Min	00	02	53
5.	Arapur				
	H. No. 181	2340 Min	00	03	84
		2227 Min	00	03	65
		3420 Min	00	04	61

[No. 12020/2/82-Prod.]

T. N. PARAMESWARAN, Under Secy.

